

By Mr. DYER: Petition of employees, customhouse, St. Louis, Mo., urging amendment to appropriation bill providing for increase for Federal employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of Cleveland conference board of International Molders' Union, urging a universal eight-hour day; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of sundry farmers of Grundy County, Ill., against the importation, duty free, of corn from Argentina; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of Bronx memorial committee, United Spanish War Veterans, New York, favoring House bill 15145, providing employment by the United States of discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Navy Yard Retirement Association, navy yard, New York, urging passage of House bill 12352 and Senate bill 4637, known as Keating-McKellar retirement bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Resolution adopted by the Rotary Club of Trenton, N. J., favoring the enactment by Congress of some law which will continue the control and operation of the wire systems by the Government until Congress shall have studied the question and determined upon a proper and safe procedure to be followed when they are returned to their private owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Hamilton Grange, No. 79, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hamilton, N. J., urging State and National Governments to appoint a representative farmer on all committees and commissions when the interest of the farmers are concerned; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Hamilton Grange, No. 79, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hamilton Square, N. J., calling upon our National Government to conduct a campaign of education which will give facts respecting the true cost of production to the people; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Mr. W. L. Cooper, and 21 other members, of Trenton local union No. 102, Brotherhood of Railway Signalmen of America, urging Government control and operation of the railways of the United States for a period of five years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of New Jersey, urging legislation providing for the national ownership and Government operation of all railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of Williamsport Merchants' Association, of Williamsport, Pa., relating to Government control of the telephone and telegraph system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Rotary Club of Williamsport, protesting against Government ownership of telephone and telegraph companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of New England Nurserymen's Association, Boston, Mass., opposing quarantine order No. 37 as contrary to the Federal plant-quarantine act of August 20, 1912; to the committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Socialist Party of Connecticut, asking that necessary steps be taken by United States to recognize the Russian Soviet Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Petition of Warren Grange, No. 536, Patrons of Husbandry, Warren, Oreg., relating to control of railroad rates and urging their restoration to the Oregon Public Service Commission, also recommending restoration of railroads of this country to owners at once; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of local board for division No. 2, Pittsburgh, Pa., urging legislation for the deportation of aliens who have taken advantage of alienage to avoid military service; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also petition of Monongahela Council, No. 491, Knights of Columbus, Pittsburgh, Pa., urging that Ireland be permitted to determine for itself the form of government under which it wishes to live; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of California Real Estate Association, indorsing appropriation of \$100,000,000 for reclamation of lands for returning soldiers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths and Helpers of America, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring continued operation of the railroads by the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Friday Morning Club, of Los Angeles, Cal., indorsing the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of 100 citizens of Kenton and Campbell Counties, Ky., asking for Government ownership of the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of city council, Chicago, Ill., urging payment of six months' compensation to all discharged soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, asking favorable consideration of the claims of Ireland for self-determination; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SWEET: Petition of citizens of Dubuque, Iowa, favoring Government ownership and control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of Council of Jewish Women of Philadelphia, Pa., urging legislation creating national department of education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. WATSON of Virginia: Petition of sundry citizens of Nottaway County, Va., in favor of the Government ownership and operation of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 19, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prottymann, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we present ourselves to Thee reverently, in the spirit of worship. We recognize Thy goodness, and put ourselves under Thy guidance. We are facing the great problems of life, not only the problems that must yield to human reason but those deeper problems that lie in the hand of God, and that can be reached and solved only as Thou dost lead us. We pray Thee to save us from error of judgment, from conceit of ignorance and pride, and give us that yielding spirit to the divine will that we may write into the laws of this Nation the will of God and establish our institutions upon the divine plan. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, February 13, 1919, when, on request of Mr. ASHURST and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harding	Norris	Smoot
Baird	Hardwick	Nugent	Spencer
Bankhead	Henderson	Page	Sterling
Beckham	Hitchcock	Pittman	Sutherland
Brandeggee	Jones, Wash.	Poindexter	Thomas
Calder	Kellogg	Pollock	Thompson
Culberson	Kendrick	Pomerene	Townsend
Cummins	Kenyon	Ransdell	Trammell
Curtis	Kirby	Reed	Underwood
Dillingham	Knox	Robinson	Vardaman
Fernald	La Follette	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Fletcher	McCumber	Shafroth	Walsh
France	McKellar	Sheppard	Warren
Gay	McLean	Sherman	Watson
Gore	McNary	Shields	Weeks
Gronna	Moses	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Hale	New	Smith, S. C.	Wolcott

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

### COST OF THE WAR (S. DOC. NO. 397).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 23, 1918, a report relative to the actual and estimated expenditures made on account of the war, which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

### GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the Secretary of the Treasury (S. Doc. No. 400) and the Secretary of the Navy (S. Doc. No. 398), transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 15, lists showing the num-



ber of civilian employees in their department on February 1 and the number discharged during the previous two weeks, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate communications from the Secretary of War (S. Doc. No. 401), the Secretary of Agriculture (S. Doc. No. 399), the Attorney General (S. Doc. No. 406), the Secretary of the Interior (S. Doc. No. 403), the Postmaster General (S. Doc. No. 407), the Secretary of Labor (S. Doc. No. 405), the Director of the War Trade Board (S. Doc. No. 404), and the Chairman of the United States Shipping Board (S. Doc. No. 402), transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 15, 1918, lists showing the number of civilian employees in their respective departments on February 12 and the number discharged during the previous two weeks, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### CLAIMS OF ARMY OFFICERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, supplemental to his letter of February 7, 1919, a list of items for the relief of officers and for the settlement of certain claims, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

#### PRODUCTION OF POTASH (S. DOC. NO. 396).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 5th instant, certain information relative to the consumption of potash in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

#### AGENTS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IN MICHIGAN (S. DOC. NO. 395).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 11th instant, certain information relative to the activities of agents of the Department of Justice in investigating alleged violations of the Federal statutes in the State of Michigan, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### COLUMBIAN DRY DOCK CO. (S. DOC. NO. 394).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, certifying that the case of the Columbian Dry Dock Co., of Baltimore, Md. against the United States, transmitted to the Court of Claims by resolution of the Senate, June 2, 1900, under the act of March 3, 1887, was dismissed by the court December 16, 1918, for want of jurisdiction, on motion of the defendants, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5279) to authorize the resumption of voluntary enlistment in the Regular Army, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3797) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 1,500 copies of the Journal of the Fifty-third National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic for the year 1918, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 14555. An act granting the consent of Congress to the board of supervisors of Itawamba County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Tombigbee River at or near Barrs Ferry, in said county; and

H. R. 15495. An act to amend an act to provide for the appointment of a commission to standardize screw threads.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington, praying for the immediate formulation of rules and regulations governing demobilization of the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 7, with

the original copy of said senate joint memorial No. 7 now on file in this office, and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original, and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington. Done at the capitol, at Olympia, this 10th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

I. M. HOWELL,  
Secretary of State.  
By J. GRANT HINKE,  
Assistant Secretary of State.

#### Senate joint memorial 7.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the Secretary of War:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, would most respectfully represent and memorialize your honorable body and the Secretary of War as follows:

That rules and regulations governing demobilization should favor the immediate release of those who are needed in business and industrial pursuits and defer the release of men without present opportunities for employment.

Wherefore your memorialists pray that your honorable body and the Secretary of War, at the earliest possible moment, formulate rules and regulations governing the demobilization, as herein indicated.

Passed the senate January 31, 1919.

LOUIS F. HART, President.

Passed the house February 5, 1919.

FRED A. ADAMS, Speaker.

Indorsed: State of Washington, ss. Filed in the office of secretary of state February 10, 1919. I. M. Howell, secretary of state.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Paragould, Ark., praying for Government ownership of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. STERLING. I present a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing Congress to appropriate money for the purchase of the wheat crop of 1919. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be read at the desk and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

[Sixteenth session Legislative Assembly State of South Dakota.]

Senate concurrent resolution, introduced by the joint committee on agriculture.

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to appropriate money for the purchase of the wheat crop of 1919 and to confer upon the President of the United States full power and authority for the handling of the same.

Whereas the price of all wheat to be produced in the United States in the year 1919 has been fixed by the President of the United States by authority of Congress, which act is of great importance to the farmers of all wheat-producing sections of the country, causing as it has the planting of a large acreage of winter wheat and the plowing and otherwise preparing for the sowing to wheat of a large acreage in the States raising spring wheat, which, owing to the high cost of labor and other factors entering into such enterprise, has required a much larger investment than for any preceding crop: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Legislature of the State of South Dakota in regular session assembled does earnestly and urgently petition the Congress of the United States to take such congressional action as may be necessary to empower the President of the United States to fulfill the contract entered into with the farmers of the United States, so that they may receive the full benefit of the price fixed for the wheat crop of 1919 without unnecessary delay, and that the Government of the United States may purchase all wheat offered it, thereby removing any danger of wheat speculators depressing prices during the period when the greater portion of the wheat crop is being placed upon the market, and enabling the Government of the United States to hold full and absolute control of the situation, to minimize the loss, if any, which might possibly otherwise occur, and to fix if deemed wise the price of flour to the consumer on a parity with that of other food products; be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies hereof be mailed to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, and to the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. STERLING. I also present two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of South Dakota, one relating to the change of the name of the Panama Canal to the Roosevelt Canal, and the other memorializing Congress to cooperate with the Dominion of Canada in the enlarged canalization of the St. Lawrence River. I ask that they be printed in the RECORD without reading and appropriately referred.

The memorials were referred, respectively, to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals and to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,  
SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

I, C. A. Burkhart, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the annexed resolution, to wit, a concurrent resolution, was duly passed by the sixteenth session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota. In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota, at the city of Pierre, February 12, 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. A. BURKHART,  
Secretary of State.



Hon. C. A. BURKHART,  
Secretary of State.

The following concurrent resolution has been adopted by the senate and concurred in by the house of representatives:

Whereas our Nation suffered a sense of bereavement personal to every American when the Maker of men recalled the intrepid soul of Theodore Roosevelt, the most virile, most brilliant, best beloved, and most typical American of his time, whose accomplishments as athlete, plainsman, soldier, author, explorer, President, and apostle of undiluted Americanism have made him a figure to touch and inspire the imagination of youth for generations; and

Whereas one of his many great achievements is represented by the canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans which his constructive and practical genius, brushing aside the bickerings, debates, and delays of 50 years, made possible: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring),* That Congress be petitioned officially to designate that American-made waterway the Roosevelt Canal, so that the same shall stand in name, as well as in historical fact, an enduring monument to his greatness, a constant reminder that the canal is, like the great President who started it, unqualifiedly American; and

*Resolved further,* That copy of this resolution, duly attested by the signatures of the presiding officers and chief clerks of the two houses, shall be transmitted to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

For the senate.

W. H. McMASTER, President.  
A. B. BLAKE, Secretary.

For the house.

LEWIS BENSON, Speaker.  
WRIGHT TARBELL, Chief Clerk.

Dated at Pierre, S. Dak., this 10th day of February, A. D. 1919.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,  
SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

I, C. A. Burkhardt, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the annexed resolution, to wit, a concurrent resolution, was duly passed by the sixteenth session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota, at the city of Pierre, February 12, 1919.

[SEAL.]

C. A. BURKHART,  
Secretary of State.

Hon. C. A. BURKHART,  
Secretary of State:

The following concurrent resolution has been adopted by the senate and concurred in by the house of representatives:

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to cooperate with the Dominion of Canada in the enlarged canalization of the St. Lawrence River for the passage of ocean-going vessels into the Great Lakes.

Whereas the Dominion of Canada has provided for the improvement of the Welland Canal, connecting Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, so that such canal will accommodate ships of 25-foot draft, 800-foot length, and 80-foot width, work on which improvement was suspended during the war and is now again being taken up and will be completed in the near future; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence River between Montreal and Lake Ontario can not be used by vessels of over 14-foot draft and 270-foot length; and

Whereas it is deemed to be a matter of great and vital importance to the United States that the St. Lawrence River be so improved that larger vessels may be accommodated and may move between the Great Lakes and the ocean: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring),* That we earnestly and urgently petition the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be deemed best and most expeditious looking to the early improvement of the St. Lawrence River by joint arrangement with the Dominion of Canada.

*Resolved further,* That copy of this resolution, duly attested by the signatures of the presiding officers and chief clerk of the two houses, shall be transmitted to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

For the senate:

W. H. McMASTER, President.  
A. B. BLAKE, Secretary.

For the house:

LEWIS BENSON, Speaker.  
WRIGHT TARBELL, Chief Clerk.

Dated at Pierre, S. Dak., this 10th day of February, A. D. 1919.

Mr. CUMMINS. I present resolutions from Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Polk County, Iowa, asking that the United States shall intercede for the freedom and independence of Ireland. I ask that the memorial, which is very short, shall be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a regular meeting of Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Polk County, Iowa, held this 9th day of February, 1919, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas this Nation was the founder of and to-day is the chosen champion of true democracy;

Whereas all nations, no matter how small or insignificant, are by inherent right entitled to rights of self-determination;

Whereas our chosen representative, President Woodrow Wilson, voicing the sentiment of the people, has time and time again openly pledged the allegiance of this country to the principle that no country shall govern without the consent of the governed;

Whereas no nation so small, or for such a long period of time, has suffered as much because of its love of freedom as Ireland;

Whereas the manhood of these glorious United States is now returning from the war they waged on a foreign soil in behalf of this same principle of the rights of small nations;

Whereas this Nation, enjoying all the privileges of a well-organized democracy, has always been on as friendly terms with Ireland as with the other European nations in whose behalf we took up the sword;

Let us be accused by our enemies of inconsistency and hypocrisy; Be it further

*Resolved,* That Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Polk County, Iowa, being associated with the Federation of Friends of Irish Freedom, is of the unanimous opinion that this Nation should, and by unanimous vote of its members asks that this Nation do, intercede in the behalf of Irish freedom and independence; and furthermore be it

*Resolved,* That a copy of these resolutions be sent to our Senators, the Hon. A. B. CUMMINS and the Hon. W. S. KENYON; our Representative in Congress, C. C. DOWELL; also that copies be furnished to the press of the city of Des Moines, Iowa, for publication.

JOHN P. O'MALLEY.  
J. P. MURPHY.  
M. T. SCANLON.  
JAMES E. O'MEARA.  
R. F. KELLEY.  
JOHN CONNALLY, Jr.

Mr. CUMMINS. I also present a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa in regard to uniforms for soldiers, which I ask be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The resolution is as follows:

*Be it resolved by the house (the senate concurring),* That the Senators and Representatives from Iowa in the Congress at Washington, D. C., be requested and urged to support the proper measures allowing all soldiers and sailors, discharged or to be discharged from the Army or Navy of the United States, to retain the clothing furnished them by the Government; be it further

*Resolved,* That a certified copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the United States Senators and Representatives from Iowa.

ARCH. W. MCFARLANE,  
Speaker of the House.  
W. H. HONEY,  
President of the Senate pro tempore.

I hereby certify that this resolution was introduced in the House on January 15, 1919, was taken up by unanimous consent, and adopted, and that it was concurred in by the Senate on January 28.

W. C. RAMSAY,  
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. CUMMINS. I present a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa in regard to the solution of the railroad problems, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas postwar and reconstruction conditions have brought the United States of America many problems of great import, and perhaps the one of greatest importance is the question of Government ownership of the railways of the United States; and

Whereas our President, in his address to Congress on December 2, 1918, said: "The question which causes me the greatest concern is the question of the policy to be adopted toward the railroads. I frankly turn to your counsel upon it"; and after making other statements on this subject, further says: "Let me say at once that I have no answer ready. The only thing that is perfectly clear to me is that it is not fair either to the public or to the owners of the railroads to leave the question unanswered, and that it will presently become my duty to relinquish control of the roads, even before the expiration of the statutory period, unless there shall appear some clear prospect in the meantime of a legislative solution. Their release would at least produce one element of its solution, viz, certainty and a quick stimulation of private initiative"; and

Whereas our President has turned to Congress for counsel on this momentous subject, in his keen sense of justice endeavoring to deal fairly with the owners of the railroads and protectively to the public welfare; and

Whereas we feel that the Congress of the United States will, by being informed of public sentiment, be better able to solve and direct the course of the problem, and recognizing the necessity, as expressed in the President's address, of relinquishing control of the railroads as quickly as possible, and the certainty of conditions that said release of the railroads by the Federal Government would immediately establish: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the house (the senate concurring) of the thirty-eighth general assembly,* That we favor the return of the railroads to their owners as soon as it can be accomplished without confusion or losses; be it further

*Resolved,* That we believe and think private ownership under strong Government control and regulation, in service, income, and disbursement is desirable, and we do not believe Federal Government ownership of railroads is for the best interest of the people at this time; be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate and the chief clerk of house forward properly authenticated copies of this resolution to each United States Senator and Member of Congress from Iowa for their consideration.

ARCH. W. MCFARLANE,  
Speaker of the House.  
PRINCE R. MOORE,  
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that this resolution was introduced in the house on February 1, 1919, was adopted on February 3, and was concurred in by the senate on February 11.

W. C. RAMSAY,  
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. NORRIS. I have two resolutions the same in language as to the heading and the signing, one passed by the State Senate of Nebraska and the other by the house of representatives of that State, in relation to an order issued by the Secretary of War. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.



The resolutions are as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
STATE OF NEBRASKA.

I, Darius M. Amsberry, secretary of state of the State of Nebraska, do hereby certify that the resolutions hereunto attached and herewith pertaining are a true, correct, complete, and verified copy of the resolutions adopted by the Senate, Legislature of Nebraska, thirty-seventh session, February 5, 1919.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Nebraska. Done at Lincoln, this 7th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1919, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-third, and of this State the fifty-second.

[SEAL.]

DARIUS M. AMSBERRY,  
Secretary of State.

LINCOLN, NEBR., February 5, 1919.

HON. D. M. AMSBERRY,  
Secretary of State, Lincoln, Nebr.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was adopted by the State senate under this date and is hereby transmitted to you:

"Whereas press reports state that several hundred men who were drafted for service in the war and refused to bear arms or work or obey orders of their superior officers, or in any manner assist in the defense of their country, or support thereof, are to be given and are being given honorable discharge from the Army, fitted out with a complete outfit of civilian clothing, and paid the full wage, and in some instances fifteen to twenty-five dollars more than that which they would have received had they been loyal to their country and served in the trenches and borne the hardships incident thereto; and

"Whereas there are several hundred thousand loyal American soldiers still in France who have willingly offered their lives in defense of their country and who are anxious to be discharged and return to private life; loyal and unselfish men who will some day return to find their positions filled by the unpatriotic slackers and conscientious objectors wearing the clothing furnished them by the Government, and with no provision made for rewarding and honoring those who have saved the country, and who by their glorious achievements have preserved to posterity the honor of the Nation: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nebraska, That we earnestly protest against the action of Secretary of War Baker in rewarding the slacker and the traitor, which we stamp as a direct insult to the brave soldiers who so valiantly went forth to defend democracy and freedom against the awful blight of Kaiserism at the sacrifice of their lives, and to the Red Cross nurses who risked their lives to administer to the wounded and bleeding upon the battle fields of Europe, and every other worker who participated in the support of the war; and we call upon the Congress of the United States to condemn the said action of Secretary Baker, as it is not consistent with the principles of true Americanism; and we further call upon Congress to honor and reward the loyal and faithful men of our Army and Navy in a manner befitting their glorious deeds: Be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to Secretary of War Baker and to the Members of Congress and the Senators from this State."

I, Clyde H. Barnard, secretary of the Senate of Nebraska, hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true, complete, and verified copy of resolution adopted by the senate February 5, 1919.

CLYDE H. BARNARD,  
Secretary State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
STATE OF NEBRASKA.

I, Darius M. Amsberry, secretary of state of the State of Nebraska, do hereby certify that the resolutions hereunto attached and herewith pertaining are a true, correct, complete, and verified copy of the resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives, Legislature of Nebraska, thirty-seventh session, February 5, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Nebraska. Done at Lincoln this 7th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1919, and of Independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-third, and of this State the fifty-second.

[SEAL.]

D. M. AMSBERRY,  
Secretary of State.  
W. L. GASTON,  
Deputy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
OFFICE OF CHIEF CLERK,  
Lincoln, Nebr., February 6, 1919.

Whereas press reports state that several hundred men, known as conscientious objectors, were drafted for service in the war and refused to bear arms or work or obey orders of their superior officers, or in any manner assist in the defense of their country or support thereof, are to be given honorable discharge from the disciplinary barracks, fitted out with a complete outfit of civilian clothing, and paid the full wage, and in some instances \$15 to \$25 more than that which they would have received had they been loyal to their country and served in the trenches and borne the hardships incident thereto; and Whereas there are several hundred thousand loyal American soldiers still in France who have willingly offered their lives in defense of their country and who are anxious to be discharged and return to private life; loyal and unselfish men, who will some day return to find their positions filled by the unpatriotic slackers and conscientious objectors wearing the clothing furnished them by the Government and with no provision made for rewarding and honoring those who have saved the country, and who by their glorious achievements have preserved to posterity the honor of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska, That we earnestly protest against the action of Secretary of War Baker in rewarding the slacker and the traitor, which we stamp as a direct insult to the brave soldiers who so valiantly went forth to defend democracy and freedom against the awful blight of Kaiserism at the sacrifice of their lives, and to the Red Cross nurses who risked their lives to administer to the wounded and bleeding upon the battle fields of Europe, and every other worker who participated in the support of the war; and we call upon the Congress of the United States to con-

demn the said action of Secretary Baker, as it is not consistent with the principles of true Americanism; and we further call upon Congress to honor and reward the loyal and faithful men of our Army and Navy in a manner befitting their glorious deeds. Be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to Secretary of War Baker and to the Members of the Congress and the Senators from this State.

D. S. DALBEY, Speaker.  
WILL F. HITCHCOCK,  
Chief Clerk.  
DARIUS M. AMSBERRY,  
Secretary of State.

Mr. HENDERSON. I present a petition signed by many citizens of Nevada in favor of the national ownership and Government operation of all the railroads of the country, which I move be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KENDRICK. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The memorial is as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
State of Wyoming, ss:

I, W. E. Chaplin, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of enrolled joint memorial No. 1, Senate, Fifteenth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, being original senate joint memorial No. 1, has been carefully compared with the original filed in this office on the 14th day of February, A. D. 1919, and is a full, true, and correct copy of the same and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming. Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 13th day of February, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL.]

W. E. CHAPLIN,  
Secretary of State.  
By H. M. SYMONS,  
Deputy.

Senate joint memorial 1.

Whereas the State has begun the construction of a comprehensive system of highways, which are essential to the development of the State; and

Whereas the vast distances within our State which must be covered by improved highways and because our present population of only 200,000 people preclude the possibility of completing this task within the next generation, if the funds are to be derived from direct taxation and such Federal aid now available; and

Whereas more than 50 per cent of the total area of Wyoming is still in the public domain, while less than 18 per cent of this area has been patented to our citizens and over 17 per cent has already been set aside as national reserve; and

Whereas our highways must necessarily be built over large areas of public lands, thus greatly enhancing their value, though there is no way to assess a proportionate share of the cost of such construction against these lands: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress be requested to set aside 2,000,000 acres of public lands in the State of Wyoming, to be known and designated as State lands, to be selected, appraised, and sold or leased by the State, and the proceeds to be used in the construction of State highways; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be sent to each of the Members of the congressional delegation from the State in Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of the General Land Office, with the request that they employ their best efforts to secure favorable action from Congress along the lines indicated.

T. G. POWERS,  
President of the Senate.  
E. J. SULLIVAN,  
Speaker of the House.

Approved:

ROBERT D. CAREY,  
Governor.

FEBRUARY 14, 1919—3.30 p. m.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Wisconsin relating to the establishment of a league of nations. I ask to have it printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The joint resolution is as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4) relating to the establishment of a league of nations.

Whereas the war, now brought to a victorious close by the associated power of the free nations of the world, was above all else a war to end war and protect human rights: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate, the assembly concurring, That we favor the establishment of a league of nations, of which the United States shall be a member. We believe that such a league should aim at promoting the liberty, progress, and orderly development of the world; that it should clinch the victory won at such terrible sacrifice by having the united potential force of all its members as a standing protection for the world against any nation that seeks to upset the peace of the world; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution properly attested by the presiding officers be sent to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of both branches of Congress, and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Wisconsin.

EDWARD F. DITTMAR,  
President of the Senate.  
O. G. MUNSON,  
Chief Clerk of the Senate.  
RILEY S. YOUNG,  
Speaker of the Assembly.  
C. G. SHAFER,  
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. CURTIS. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas, relative to the construction of a



military highway connecting Fort Leavenworth, Camp Funston, and Fort Bliss, in the State of Kansas, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution.

*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Kansas (both houses concurring therein):—*

Whereas the great war has demonstrated the necessity of good roads for military efficiency; and

Whereas the Fort Leavenworth, Camp Funston, Fort Bliss National Military Highway Association, representing the States of Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Kansas, meeting at Hutchinson, Kans., on Monday, January 20, 1919, has prepared a satisfactory route for such a highway, connecting the three great military posts of the Middle West, Fort Leavenworth, Camp Funston, and Fort Bliss, and has effected a strong and effective organization to carry out the said project, and has taken the preliminary steps to memorialize Congress in its favor: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we request our Senators and Representatives to use every effort to secure the necessary appropriations, either by special bill or as a part of the military appropriations, for the construction of the highway approved by the said association as a military highway to be built and maintained by the Federal Government, open, however, to civilian traffic under such rules and regulations as the War Department may impose.

CHAS. S. HOFFMAN,  
Lieutenant Governor.  
E. D. GEORGE,  
Secretary.

Mr. CURTIS presented a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Salina, Kans., and a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Concordia, Kans., favoring the return to private ownership of the railroads of the country, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Rotary Club of Wichita, Kans., favoring the return to private ownership of telephone and telegraph lines, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Parsons, Labette, and Goodland, all in the State of Kansas, praying for Government ownership of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the United Trades and Labor Council of Pittsburg, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Sumner County, Kans., praying for Government ownership of railroads, express, telephone and telegraph lines, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Central Labor Union of Arkansas City, Kans., and a resolution adopted by Local Union No. 555, Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, of Arkansas City, Kans., favoring the proposed restriction on immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of Council No. 90, Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, of Wichita, Kans., praying for the adoption of an eight-hour work day and for increased compensation for overtime work, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 32, Farmers' Educational Cooperative Union of America, of Republic County, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation guaranteeing the minimum price of \$2.20 per bushel for the 1919 wheat crop, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Education of Lawrence, Kans., remonstrating against the honorable discharge of conscientious objectors, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of Stringtown Grange No. 1489, Patrons of Husbandry, of Burlington, Kans., remonstrating against compulsory military training, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Education of Hutchinson, Kans., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of Kansas City, Kans., favoring the granting of six months' additional pay to honorably discharged soldiers and sailors, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 555, Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, of Arkansas City, Kans., remonstrating against the supreme peace council making any effort to regulate labor, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association of Manhattan, Kans., praying for an increase in

the salaries of veterinary inspectors in the Bureau of Animal Industry, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of Lew Gove Post No. 100, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Manhattan, Kans., remonstrating against the transferring to the War Department of Battle Mountain Sanitarium, of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WARREN presented telegrams in the nature of petitions from the Commercial Club of Sheridan, the Commercial Club of Buffalo, and the Merchants' Credit Association of Cody, all in the State of Wyoming, praying for the return to private ownership of telephone and telegraph lines, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13482) creating a commission for the maintenance, control, care, etc., of the Perry's victory memorial on Put in Bay Island, Lake Erie, Ohio, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 222) extending until July 1, 1920, the effective date of section 10 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. WEEKS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5313) authorizing the Secretary of War to acquire and maintain a cemetery in France in the name of the United States for the reception and interment of the bodies of American officers and men who lost their lives in connection with the European war, and to appropriate \$500,000 therefor, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 731) thereon.

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 4729) to exclude certain lands from the Pike National Forest Reservation, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 734) thereon.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3964) for the relief of Otis C. Mooney, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 733) thereon.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15706) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 735) thereon.

#### JENNIE M. HEATH.

Mr. WALSH. From the Committee on Pensions I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 10225) striking from the pension roll the name of Jennie M. Heath, and I submit a report (No. 730) thereon. It is a bill reducing the pension roll instead of increasing it, and if there be no objection I ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to strike from the pension roll the name of Jennie M. Heath, helpless and dependent child of Charles E. Heath, late of Company G, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, who is now pensioned by special act of Congress approved August 7, 1914.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Montana explain the reason for this action?

Mr. WALSH. The name was put upon the pension roll by mistake.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### DISTRICT ATTORNEY FOR CONNECTICUT.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 4246) to increase the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Connecticut, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That from and after the passage of this act the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Connecticut shall be at the rate of \$4,500 a year.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.



Mr. BRANDEGEE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the Record the House report upon the bill increasing the salary of the district attorney of Connecticut which the Senate passed early in the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the request of the Senator from Connecticut is granted.

The report is as follows:

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4246) providing for an increase of salary of the United States attorney for the district of Connecticut, having had the same under consideration, unanimously recommend that the bill do pass, with the following amendment:

On line 5, after the word "of," strike out "\$5,000" and in lieu thereof insert "\$4,500."

The State of Connecticut comprises one judicial district with a population of 1,114,756, as of 1910, and the law provides for the holding of court at New Haven and Hartford. The present salary of the United States attorney for this district is \$2,500. The population of the district has increased more than 600,000 since the salary was fixed at \$2,500, and your committee believe that at present it is wholly inadequate.

The present incumbent states that between March 1, 1917, and March 15, 1918, there were 253 criminal cases begun and 236 cases closed, and 28 civil cases begun and 11 closed, while during the same period there were approximately 100 complaints made which never developed in cases.

The population of the different other New England States and the salaries paid the United States attorneys therein follow:

Maine, 742,371; salary, \$3,000.  
New Hampshire, 430,572; salary, \$2,000.  
Vermont, 355,956; salary, \$3,000.  
Massachusetts, 3,366,416; salary, \$5,000.  
Rhode Island, 542,610; salary, \$2,500.

In the first session of the Sixty-third Congress a bill (S. 281) passed the United States Senate approving an increase in the salary of the United States attorney for Connecticut to \$4,000, and that was before the large amount of extra work entailed by the war was added to the routine of the office. On account of the outbreak of the European conflict at that time, the House took no action, as the policy adopted at the period was that no more bills for increases in salaries should be considered.

The clerk of the court receives about \$6,000 a year. The internal-revenue officer for the district receives \$4,500 a year. The postmaster at Hartford receives \$6,000 a year. The salary of the collector of customs for Connecticut is \$5,000 a year.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. CUMMINS. From the Committee on Rules I report back favorably, with an amendment, Senate resolution 339, submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], to amend Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate by adding thereto a paragraph restricting and regulating membership of certain committees of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 732) thereon. I ask that the report of the committee be printed in the Record. I make this request because at the first convenient time after to-morrow I intend to ask for the consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. CUMMINS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration Senate resolution No. 339, recommends the adoption thereof with the following amendment: Strike out lines 4 to 10, inclusive, and substitute therefor the following:

"Beginning with the first session of the Senate of the Sixty-sixth Congress no Senator shall be a member of more than two of the following standing committees of the Senate, namely, Appropriations, Agriculture and Forestry, Commerce, Finance, Foreign Relations, Interstate Commerce, Judiciary, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, and Post Offices and Post Roads. No Senator being chairman of either of the committees named in this paragraph shall be appointed on a conference committee upon any bill reported by either of the last-named standing committees unless it is reported by the committee of which he is the chairman."

The purpose of the proposed amendment to the rules is, in the judgment of this committee, commendable, and it is believed that the results of its adoption will be salutary. The object sought to be obtained in restricting the assignment of Members of the Senate to places upon the 10 chief standing committees is to secure a proper distribution of the work of the Senate among its Members, and thereby not only facilitate the disposition of the public business, but to insure a more careful consideration of the bills which are referred to these committees.

With respect to the limitation upon appointments upon conference committees, it is hoped that there will be accomplished a more equitable division of the responsibilities of legislation; a division that will have a tendency, at least, to give all the Members of the Senate an incentive to fit themselves for the important labors which fall upon conference committees.

It may not be amiss to say that the action of the Committee on Rules was unanimous.

#### CONNECTICUT RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 13369) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Connecticut River between Springfield and West Springfield, in Hampden County, Mass., and I ask that it be considered at the present time.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Texas if he will not wait until morning business has been

finished and then ask for the consideration of the bill? The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] has consented to wait until then, as there is considerable morning business that ought to be attended to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I withdraw the report for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report is withdrawn.

#### LOAN OF AIRCRAFT MOTORS.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 205) permitting the loan of aircraft motors and aircraft material to educational institutions under certain conditions.

I will say that the consideration of this joint resolution will not require a moment's discussion. The facts are simply these: Two or three educational institutions, among them the College of the City of New York, have requested of the War Department the loan of Liberty motors for the use of students of those colleges. The War Department is perfectly willing to make the loan, but lacks the authority to do so. This joint resolution simply confers authority upon the War Department to make such loans at its own discretion, reserving to the Government the title to the motors and all other material.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, do I understand the joint resolution applies to certain specified colleges, or is it a general law that applies to all colleges which are similarly situated?

Mr. NEW. The joint resolution is general in its application, so that such loans may be made to any college that wants them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the joint resolution ought to be read. I should like to know its terms.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The amendment was, in section 1, page 1, line 5, after the word "loan," to strike out "to bona fide educational institutions in the United States aircraft motors and aircraft equipment in such instance as in the judgment of the Secretary of War beneficial educational purposes can be served by such loan," and to insert "aircraft motors and aircraft equipment to such educational institutions in the United States as provide advanced mechanical and technical instruction, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe," so as to make the section read:

That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and empowered, for the purpose of aiding, fostering, and promoting educational experimentation work, to loan aircraft motors and aircraft equipment to such educational institutions in the United States as provide advanced mechanical and technical instruction, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### OIL AND GAS LANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 2812) to encourage and promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Nevada if he will not defer that request until we get through with morning business? We have not had a morning hour for a long time. There are bills and resolutions to be introduced, and it seems to me that the Senator should wait until we get through with the formal morning business.

Mr. PITTMAN. I recognize that there is a great deal of merit in the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska, and it was my intention to wait until the morning business had been concluded before moving to take up this matter, as I gave notice yesterday that I should do; but there are so many bills now being passed by unanimous consent—

Mr. NORRIS. There has been only one such bill, and I think with this statement there should be no more requests for unanimous consent to pass bills during the morning hour, and the Senator's request should be deferred also.

Mr. PITTMAN. Of course, I defer to the pleasure of the Senate in the matter. I withdraw the request.

Mr. ASHURST. I shall object to any other bill being considered at this time.

#### DISCHARGED SICK AND DISABLED SOLDIERS.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, yesterday I gave notice that during the morning hour to-day I would ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill reported by me from the



Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, being House bill 13026, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers and sailors. The passage of the bill is absolutely vital if we are to provide for the discharge of disabled soldiers of the United States. I desire to say that I intend to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this bill as soon as we get through with morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Bills and joint resolutions are in order.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GORE (by request):

A bill (S. 5636) providing for the enactment of a credit-union law in the District of Columbia by which the officers of such credit union shall be empowered to receive deposits from and make loans to the stockholders thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 5637) granting an increase of pension to George Montgomery (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 5638) to provide for election contests in the Senate of the United States; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 5639) to establish and promote civic, social, and health extension education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NUGENT:

A bill (S. 5640) donating captured cannon to the towns of Coeur d'Alene, Sandpoint, and Gooding, in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 5641) requiring The Adjutant General of the United States Army and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain data to the adjutants general of the several States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, on October 10, 1918, I introduced a bill to create a department of education, which is Senate bill 4987. I have modified that bill somewhat and I desire to introduce it anew to-day and have it referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The bill (S. 5635) to create a department of education, to appropriate money for the conduct of said department, to appropriate money to encourage the States in the promotion and support of education, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In connection with introducing the new bill I wish to ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 4987, and that it be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is indefinitely postponed.

#### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. KNOX submitted an amendment authorizing the President to appoint Col. George K. McGunnegle, United States Army, retired, to the position and rank of brigadier general, on the retired list, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California submitted an amendment providing that the transportation from the District of Columbia of governmental employees whose services are no longer required or who may resign from their positions, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### NITRATE PLANT AT SHEFFIELD, ALA.

Mr. GORE. I offer a Senate resolution, which I send to the desk, and I ask for its present consideration.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me for just a moment? On account of an important meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee, I am compelled to leave the Senate, and I have a Senate resolution which I desire to offer and to have read before I leave the Chamber.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from that purpose.

Mr. NORRIS. I submit a Senate resolution and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The resolution (S. Res. 459) was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs be instructed to make an investigation and report to the Senate its findings of fact upon the following:

First. What inducement, if any, did the War Department offer to officers and enlisted men in investigating and making improvements in the method of extracting nitrogen from the air in the United States Nitrate Plant No. 1 at Sheffield, Ala.?

Second. What improvement, if any, in such process was invented by Capt. R. S. Tour and Second Lieut. F. C. Binnall?

Third. Was any such improvement discovered by the said Capt. Tour and said Second Lieut. Binnall patentable under the laws of the United States?

Fourth. If any such process so discovered was patentable, were the said Capt. Tour and said Second Lieut. Binnall required by any official of the War Department, by coercion or otherwise against their will, to assign such patentable rights to the General Chemical Co.?

#### FREIGHT RATES ON WHEAT AND WHEAT FLOUR.

Mr. GORE. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 458) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and is hereby, directed to inform the Senate as to the comparative freight rates on wheat and on wheat flour, and if there be a differential to state the same and cite typical cases.

#### AMERICAN TROOPS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. McCUMBER. I offer an amendment to Senate resolution 411, submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], requesting that our soldiers be withdrawn from Russia. As that subject has been discussed and the amendment is pertinent, I will ask that the Secretary read it, and that it be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Amend Senate resolution 411 by striking out the same and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Whereas by a revolution in Russia in the month of March, 1917, the government of that country was wrested from its autocratic rulers and the people proceeded to establish a representative form of government and duly elected a congress to administer its affairs; and

"Whereas through the instrumentality of a German propaganda and by intrigue and bribery a counter-revolution was inaugurated which overthrew the government so established by the Russian people and abolished and dispersed their representative body; and

"Whereas through the basest treachery and at the most perilous period in the history of the war their criminal element controlling the destinies of Russia abandoned the cause of the allies, betrayed their comrades in war and their country, and made their country subservient to the demands of the central powers, thereby enabling those powers to withdraw all their armies from the east and use them in a final blow on the western front to destroy the cause of Russia and her allies; and

"Whereas Lenin and Trotsky and other so-called officers of the Bolshevik element now devastating Russia are not only our enemies but, worse than enemies, are traitors to the cause of liberty and civilization; and

"Whereas the atrocities committed by them are manifold greater than all the atrocities charged against the invading German armies or committed by the Turkish armies in Armenia; and

"Whereas the President of the United States pledged the good offices and support of this Government to assist the Russian people in establishing a representative government, and assured, as one of the 14 articles of peace conditions, the cooperation of this and other allied nations in obtaining for Russia an unhampered and unbiased opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development, and agreed to extend to her the more than welcome assistance of every kind that she might need; and

"Whereas the vast majority of the Russian people are bitterly opposed to the Bolshevik rule, with all its atrocities, but are unorganized and unable to maintain their rights; and

"Whereas if the Bolshevik criminals now in control of that unhappy country are allowed to continue their robberies and murders and to annihilate the more intelligent and patriotic class of Russian citizenship, that whole country will soon be dominated and controlled by Germany, and the sacrifice of the millions of men who have died to check the world's domination of the German Empire will have been in vain: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That by every principle of national honor and military strategy and for the defense of the civilization of the world, for which millions of men have laid down their lives in this great war, it is the duty of the United States and our allies from both a moral and military standpoint to immediately send a sufficient army into Petrograd and Moscow and other Russian points to defeat the murderous band of pillagers in Russia known as the Bolsheviks, and to protect the decent, intelligent, and patriotic people of Russia until they shall have been able to elect a representative congress to govern and control that country."

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask that the amendment go over under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will lie over and be printed.

#### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5236) to amend sections 7, 10, and 11 of the Federal reserve act, and section 5172, Revised Statutes of the United States.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, and request a conference with the



House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair. The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. OWEN, Mr. HITCHCOCK, and Mr. McLEAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (No. 69) of the House of Representatives, which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed as a House document 1,500 copies of the journal of the Fifty-third National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic for the year 1919, not to exceed \$1,700 in cost, with illustrations, 1,000 copies of which shall be for the use of the House and 500 for the use of the Senate.*

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 14555. An act granting the consent of Congress to the board of supervisors of Itawamba County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Tombigbee River at or near Barrs Ferry, in said county, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 15495. An act to amend an act to provide for the appointment of a commission to standardize screw threads was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures.

#### OIL AND GAS LANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, is a motion now in order to proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 2812?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. PITTMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 2812.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2812) to encourage and promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, this conference report is entitled to very deliberate consideration. It deals with a matter which has divided the public opinion of the country for a number of years, upon which there has been more or less of a deadlock in legislation; so I assume that Senators will desire an opportunity for a thorough examination of the details of the agreement which has been reached by the conference committee, and that the matter can not be disposed of in a few moments.

While that is pending, Mr. President, I desire to call attention to another situation.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, before the Senator goes to the other situation, I should like with his permission simply to make a suggestion in keeping with what he has already said, without making a speech, of course.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Very well; I have no objection.

Mr. PITTMAN. For the benefit of the Senate, on yesterday I had the full report printed in the RECORD, so that it appears in the RECORD this morning. It shows the bill as agreed upon by the conferees, and an itemized statement of each change made in the Senate bill as well as in the House bill; so that it will facilitate the examination of the report by the Senate.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think it is very well that the Senator from Nevada called attention to that, so that Senators may know where to find the printed report.

Mr. PITTMAN. And the Senator from Nevada refrained from making any brief statement with regard to the changes that took place in the Senate bill, out of respect for the notice that the Senator from Washington had given that on this morning he would address himself to another subject.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I appreciate exceedingly the courtesy of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PITTMAN. So soon as the Senator has finished I will make a brief statement—unless, of course, it interferes with some other Senator—in regard to the changes made in the Senate bill by the conference committee.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, this same report was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of a week ago, the matter being presented in the House, so that the whole report and a copy of the bill have been on record in the House proceedings for more than a week.

#### LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the most conspicuous item of news in the headlines of the morning papers refers to an Associated Press dispatch from Paris, the principal digest of which I read from one of the morning papers, which I have at hand, as follows:

Delegates anxious to take up peace treaty and to end war status.

Mr. President, it has been more than three months since the solemn and formal armistice was signed, bringing to an end actual military operations between the allies and Germany; so that it arrests one's attention to read after that lapse of time as the principal news which is published in the world from Paris, to which the gaze of all men is directed, the statement that the delegates to the peace conference now, on the 19th day of February—the armistice having been agreed to on the 11th day of November—are beginning to become anxious to take up and consider, at least, the peace treaty to bring an end to the status of war.

I read a moment ago in an edition of a noon paper which has just been circulated the news—which will startle the world—that Georges Clemenceau, the great leader of France in the heroic war which has terminated in her victory, has been the object of an assassin's bullet. Fortunately for humanity, the assassin failed of his purpose, and Clemenceau still lives. I say fortunately for humanity, because of all men the world could least afford to lose at this juncture, in this great epoch of its affairs, is the French premier, who has stood for victory and for efficiency in the fight of civilization against the German hordes.

I mention that, Mr. President, because it seems to me that it is a symptom of a disease which is afflicting the world and social affairs, and which is being irritated and aggravated to the point where it may become chronic by the delay of the conference, which was called to secure and establish peace, in performing the duties for which it gathered. Assassination is a weapon of those who represent the internationale, of those who have taken up the cause of international revolution, which is now beginning to be active in the United States as well as in the countries of Europe and which needs to be cured by the establishment of definite and permanent peace.

Mr. President, there are two divisions of men upon this question. One of those divisions advocates the proposition that before we establish present peace we should provide, by some as yet ill-defined means, for permanent and universal future peace. The other division of men who are interested in this great question believes, on the contrary, that the first duty of the world is to establish present peace, to restore order in Europe, and that instead of satisfying ourselves with expressions of interest in the future welfare of mankind the leaders of the Governments should demonstrate their sincerity by relieving the present suffering which afflicts the world.

There is another division of public opinion upon this question, Mr. President. One division of public opinion upon the question of peace believes that permanent peace can not be secured for the United States or for the rest of the world by the traditional policies of the American Government. Those who take that view of the matter believe that in order to arrive at a satisfactory basis of peace not only must we ignore and neglect the duty of bringing the present war to an end, but that we should cast aside, as the refuse of government, the great policies of the past, and adopt new policies, and make, as they express it, a new order in the world. The other party believes that the great men who have formulated public opinion in America in the past, shaped its policies, and achieved its greatness were as sincere and as intelligent advocates of peace, of permanent peace, as those who are in charge of American affairs to-day.

So the question arises, Was Washington a friend of peace? Did he desire the world to dwell in amity and good will, one nation with another? And so the question arises, With what purpose did Washington enunciate a foreign policy for the new Government which his fortitude and wisdom had been the chief agents in establishing? Was its purpose war, or was not its purpose the same purpose which is now proclaimed throughout the world—to secure peace, maintain good will among nations, and security and happiness among the people of the world? I think that was the object of Washington's advice against entangling alliances. Was it the purpose of Monroe, when he in an earlier generation than ours proclaimed that famous policy which bears his name, to sow the seeds of war and discord? I think not. I think his purpose was peace. Was Cleveland an advocate of war when he enforced that doctrine when it was attacked? Was Roosevelt promoting war or was he securing peace when he, in his turn, as President



of the United States, resisted the efforts of the German Empire to invade the traditional policy of America? He was rewarded by an impartial tribunal to whom had been intrusted the prize to be bestowed upon those who contributed most to the peace of the world.

They were all for peace; and, Mr. President, all intelligent men and women are for peace. The question is, Does the proposition which is presented to the world tend to promote peace to a greater extent than those policies which have secured peace for America during the greater part of its career, or, on the contrary, does it add to the opportunity, to the cause, and to the temptation for war?

Mr. President, it is perhaps not an exaggeration to say that the matters contained in the proposed constitution of the league of nations, recently reported by a special committee authorized to investigate and report by the peace congress, are the most momentous in their effect upon the Government and the people of the United States since the Civil War. They are closely related, in fact, to the problems presented for discussion and determination by the people in the formation of the Constitution of the United States. In adopting or rejecting this constitution—and I quote the words which the instrument itself uses in characterizing it as a constitution—and thereby becoming or not becoming a member of the league established under it, the Government and the people of the United States will determine whether they are to remain the great sovereign and independent Nation, with the most complete self-government ever devised by man and the highest functions of citizenship ever enjoyed—a people controlling their own destiny, determining for themselves, through their constituted Government, the extent of their military preparations, the size of their armies and navies, maintaining peace and amity with the world during the greater part of their career, establishing for themselves their international relations—or whether, on the other hand, they are to merge their destinies with those of the other nations of the world, share their burdens, participate in their quarrels, and become a party to all the international complications arising from diversity of race and language and conflict of interests of the various peoples of Asia, Africa, and Europe. Are we to surrender to an international council and body of delegates those high functions of sovereignty which heretofore we have exercised for ourselves, and vest in the jurisdiction of an international league the determination of our armaments, the decision of peace or of war, even in the most vital questions affecting our national honor, integrity, or material welfare? I think I can demonstrate that that is the issue which is to be determined.

There is this further question involved of whether or not we would be promoting the cause of peace in the world by the adoption of this constitution, or, on the other hand, would be plunging the world into a new set of controversies, and, by requiring every nation to meddle with every other nation's business, would be bringing about an indefinite series of armed conflicts. "Mind your own business" is a good motto for an individual, and heretofore it has been the fundamental principle of our foreign policy as a Nation. It has saved us from many wars and given us long eras of peace, in which we have developed our social and industrial life, brought happiness to our people, and waxed great and prosperous among the nations of the world. The question is now presented of whether we are to adhere to this policy of Washington and Monroe, of cultivating friendly relations with all nations and making entangling alliances with none, or whether we are to enter into a treaty and adopt a constitution of a league which binds us to a great number, and possibly to all, of the other nations of the world in the most entangling alliance that could be conceived, since it binds us as one of the guardians and guarantors of every right or interest of any of these nations which might be involved in actual or threatened war.

These are great questions, and if so decided as to commit the United States to what the President himself has described as "a new order in the world," will deprive our people of that high and mighty state which they and their fathers have builded for themselves. There is no other citizenship in the world so entirely free of class distinction, or discrimination, as that of the American people. There is no other nation which to-day is more absolutely sovereign than the United States. There is no other nation where an individual citizen, standing upon an absolute legal and governmental equality with every other citizen, wields an equal voice in determining the highest prerogatives of government. There is no other nation where all of its members occupy the high estate which these conditions secure to the American people. The question now presented is whether or not this high sovereign jurisdiction of the political heirs of Jefferson, Washington, and Lincoln is to be in part surrendered and subjected to the control of strangers and aliens.

We have heard a great deal, Mr. President, in recent years of the right of the people themselves to direct the affairs of government; and if the people themselves are to participate at all in the decision of these mighty issues it is absolutely necessary that the question should be submitted to them for free discussion and full consideration in every forum and at every fireside. The basis of a successful republic is an intelligent public opinion. But there can be no intelligent public opinion without free communication of news, full information, and unhampered discussion, both in the press, in the public councils, and among the people themselves. Surely if these principles apply to the ordinary affairs of government they apply to an extraordinary program, by which it is planned to establish a "new order in the world." The constitution of the league of nations, which was printed in the afternoon papers of Friday, February 14, 1919, was framed in secret. Until it was so published the world, whose future was to be controlled by its terms, was purposely kept in entire ignorance of any of its provisions. It came forth full panoplied, as though born from the head of Jove. On the same day a eulogy of its terms and an argument in its behalf was made by the President. On the morning of February 16, 1919, there was published to the world a request from the President that its provisions be not debated in Congress until he should have an opportunity, in a private meeting with the members of the Foreign Relations Committees of Congress, to further speak in its advocacy and to justify not only the principles involved but the very form of its language, article by article.

In the meantime, under this plan, while Congress, the council of the people, is to remain silent, the various organizations, such as the League to Enforce Peace, the Society of Free Nations, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and other internationalists employing an ex-President of the United States as one of their chief lecturers and including members of the Cabinet, are busy in appealing to the American people in its behalf. Before the busy world, whose destinies are to be controlled by this new dispensation, has had an opportunity to thoroughly read and digest its provisions, we are requested not to make it the subject of debate in Congress until the President can again speak in its behalf. The situation is very similar to that when the people of this country indignantly protested against premature negotiations for peace with Germany, and were told to leave the discussion of terms of peace to the Governments involved and to busy themselves with providing the necessary funds.

So we are requested here, Mr. President, while the advocates of this supergovernment of the world are making arguments in its favor, to remain silent. It is a matter, however, of too much importance for us to remain altogether silent. No harm can be done by full discussion. These great questions should be considered from every standpoint and should be decided in the full light of public information and well-informed public opinion. If the proposals contained in the constitution of the league are meritorious, they will be strengthened by debate. If they are unwise or ill-advised, that fact may be disclosed by free discussion. No injury can possibly accrue to anyone by the freest and most painstaking examination of the provisions of this proposed constitution of the world.

We are all in favor of giving effect to "humane impulses" in the government of the world. We ardently desire peace. Whatever steps we can take which will relieve the oppressed, establish justice, inculcate virtue, and bring happiness to mankind we advocate. There is no monopoly of benevolence, of humane impulses, of the desire, if possible, to obtain universal and perpetual peace. The question is the adoption of means which will really promote to the utmost extent these great and beneficent ends. It is to be determined in the discussion of the league of nations what the language of its constitution imports and whether or not it will promote, in truth and in fact, the welfare of mankind. There are many who contend that it will provoke and precipitate war and entail untold misery upon mankind by the conflicts, jealousies, and surrenders which it would bring about. These are entitled to be heard. If their views and deductions are wrong, their fallacy will be easily exposed. It is, we are told, a day of "open covenants openly arrived at," and never was there a covenant since the chosen people followed the ark in the wilderness that was so fraught with good or evil for the children of men. If covenants are to be openly arrived at, this covenant, of all others, should be exposed to the light and to discussion in the open.

It is intended as a permanent and universal league and covenant. I think that feature may well be emphasized, and I will speak a moment later of the fact that there is no provision in it for abrogating any covenant of adherence to it. It binds



mankind and their destinies forever. The question at once arises whether, when we have once committed ourselves to its power, we can ever withdraw. It no doubt will be contended by its advocates that we can renounce our allegiance and abrogate our agreement at any time. It was so contended by many of the States who joined the Federal Union.

Some of them ratified the Constitution of the United States upon that express condition. Virginia did; I think that New York did, reserving the right to withdraw from the Federation at will. This, however, was decided to the contrary by the Union itself, and over the question was fought the bloodiest war, with the most pitiful sacrifices of a noble race of men. There is nothing, Mr. President, in the proposed constitution of the league of nations which provides for its abrogation or for the secession of its members. When power is once in their hands, its executive council, with its changing membership and the uncertain virtues of rulers, may likewise decide that its obligations are binding forever upon its members. It may well be considered by the Senate whether such a question should be left to implication or doubt.

In its simplicity of form, the absence of what might be called specialization of functions of the government of this constitution of nations, the machinery of the league is similar to the Soviet government of Russia. Its "body of delegates" and "executive council" and "permanent secretariat" are very largely a duplication of the framework of the Soviets.

Now, Mr. President, coming to the substance of this constitution of a league of nations, I may say that there are five principal matters of prime importance contained in the constitution, and it is in regard to those, because the others are of comparatively slight importance, that I desire to speak.

First. There is contained in this constitution a surrender by the several nations to the league of the power and discretion of determining the rules, methods, and degree of disarmament, and the relative and absolute size of the Army and Navy which any member of the league may maintain.

Second. Compulsory arbitration of all questions of every kind and description, even those which heretofore have been regarded as nonjusticiable, affecting the vital interests, honor, and even the independence of the nations.

There is no exception whatever. No question concerning the welfare or even the existence of the United States can arise in controversy with another nation which, if this league is adopted and its provisions enforced, our people will not be compelled to submit to a foreign tribunal and abide by its decision.

Third. The commitment of each member of the league, including the United States, if it should become a member, to participate in the wars and controversies of every other nation, and to assume the general guardianship of "various peoples," quoting from the constitution itself, in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Fourth. The participation by the league, through an international bureau of labor, in the domestic, social, economic, and industrial problems, quoting from the constitution of the league, "both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend." This is contained in article 20 of the proposed constitution, and the extent of the participation and powers of the international bureau of labor are left entirely vague and indefinite. What steps will be taken by the league or what power it will legitimately have to carry out the policies declared in this article are left to the wide discretion of the league itself, as there is no limitation placed upon it.

Fifth. The surrender by the United States to the other members of the league—I say to the other members of the league because the other members of the league constitute the overwhelming majority and will direct its action—of the power which under our Government is vested by the Constitution in Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations in arms and ammunition. This is contained in article 18 in the following language: "The high contracting parties agree that the league shall be intrusted with general supervision of the trade in arms and ammunition with the countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary in the common interest."

Of course, the league is to determine in what country its control is necessary. There is no limit, consequently, placed upon the power of the league to supervise the commerce of the United States or any other nation in arms and ammunition, which power under the Constitution of the United States is vested in Congress.

The control of trade in arms and ammunition is one of the most essential attributes of sovereignty. It has been exercised by the United States in various ways, at various times, and in relation to various countries. It is one of the chief weapons of defense, both direct and indirect, whether in the matter of export or import of arms and ammunition from or into the United States

itself, as in the case of neighboring countries, such as Mexico or Cuba, in the matter of a controversy between them and the United States, or whether in the matter of the shipment of munitions of war to other belligerents, in the exercise of their belligerent rights, in a war which, as in the case of the present war with Germany before we ourselves became a belligerent, indirectly involved our most vital interests.

Mr. President, the provisions of the constitution of the league as proposed, giving the league absolute discretion as to the armament of its several members, are contained in articles 7, 8, and 9 of the proposed constitution. I want to ask Senators to pay particular attention to article 7, especially to one part of it. It contains an unequivocal provision, as follows:

No State shall be admitted to the league unless its people give effective guaranties of its sincere intention to observe its international obligations and unless it shall conform to such principles as may be prescribed by the league in regard to its naval and military forces and armaments.

Under this the determination of what are the international obligations of the United States, once it has joined the league, will be taken from the people of the United States, where it is now vested, and given to the league of nations, and the United States will be absolutely bound by every order of the league, backed by its power, as to our naval and military forces and armaments.

Article 8 provides for a different degree of disarmament in the different nations in accordance with "the geographical situation and circumstances of each State," and that "the executive council shall also determine, for the consideration and action of the several governments, what military equipment and armament is fair and reasonable in proportion to the scale of forces laid down in the program of disarmament, and these limits, when adopted, shall not be exceeded without the permission of the executive council."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will it interrupt the Senator from Washington if I ask him a question?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No.

Mr. REED. At this point will the Senator advise us who the executive council is to be? I do not mean the personnel, but how it is to be made up?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is impossible to tell who the entire representation on the executive council will be. Five of its members of nine shall be the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan, and they shall select four others. If they should select Germany, for instance—Germany, one of the great populations of the world, with something like 77,000,000 or 80,000,000 of people, an industrious people, capable of a high degree of organization, very likely would be selected as a member of the executive council—then if, with that capacity which Germany has for propaganda and for organization and for manipulation, she should be able to secure the cooperation of the other three of these additional four members, then, with one other out of the five, she could control the executive council of the league.

Mr. REED. But, as the league will stand on its initial organization, it will have how many members?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It will have nine members.

Mr. REED. And how many votes will the United States have?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It will have one.

Mr. REED. So that the question of how much of an army or how much of a navy the United States may have is to be determined by a tribunal upon which the United States will have but one vote and foreign nations will have eight votes?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Exactly; that is the proposition.

Mr. REED. That is a complete surrender, is it not, of America's vital right to defend herself, to a tribunal that is made up, eight to one, of non-Americans and that may be composed eight to one of enemies of America?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Certainly; it is to be composed eight to one, of conflicting interests, of rival powers of America, entirely different in their environments, in their interests, and in their traditions from the United States.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, is it not also true that any nation, however small, or without regard to its population, its extent, or its resources, will be as powerful, if admitted to membership in this league, as is the United States itself?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It will be as powerful, so far as its vote is concerned. Of course, it would not be as powerful in directing the affairs of the league, for ultimately the league is based upon force, however much argument may be made to the contrary.

Mr. STERLING. I mean, if the Senator from Washington will permit me, in any decision arrived at by the league?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Absolutely.

Mr. REED. Let me ask one further question.



Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will first yield to the Senator from Nebraska and then I will yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. NORRIS. Is it not true that the small nations, about which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] has spoken, would not be members of the executive council, and that, in order to have the same influence in the affairs of the league as the United States, for instance, a nation would have to be represented on the executive council?

Mr. STERLING. But, Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will permit me a moment, I suppose the ultimate power rests in the league itself and in the delegates to the league, and each nation admitted to the league will have but one delegate, or at least one vote, though it may have three representatives.

Mr. NORRIS. Such a nation would not, probably, have a vote in the executive council unless it was a member of it, because the executive council is confined to a membership of nine, and they are named.

Mr. STERLING. It might not. They are named in the present constitution of the league; but when it comes to the action of the league itself Serbia or Cuba will have as much power in that action as will the United States of America.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I am very glad to yield in the course of my remarks on this subject to any Senator to ask a question or to answer a question to the best of my ability, but I should much prefer that colloquies or debates between other Senators be postponed until the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Washington pardon me one further question in the line of those I was asking?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. REED. In this executive council, which is primarily to be composed of nine men, representing nine different countries, the United States, having one representative, is it not true that Japan will have a vote equal with that of the United States?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Certainly; that is true.

Mr. REED. That is to say, we propose to enter a league in which we give to Japan a vote concerning our destiny equal to our own vote, although we refuse to allow a Japanese citizen to become a citizen of the United States?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Japan would have the same vote that the United States has on the executive council; but I think the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is mistaken in the assumption that small nations will not be represented on the executive council. There is no such limitation as that. There are four vacancies on the executive council.

Mr. NORRIS. When those are filled, that will complete the list.

Mr. POINDEXTER. They can be filled by representatives of small nations.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; they might be; but the point I want to make is that in order for any so-called small nation to have the same power in this league that the United States, for instance, would have, it must be a member of the executive council, of which there can be but nine members.

Mr. POINDEXTER. So far as the executive council is concerned, a member would have more influence than a mere delegate.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, article 9 of the proposed constitution provides that "a permanent commission shall be constituted to advise the league on the execution of the provisions of article 8, and on military and naval questions generally." That is the disarmament program.

Under the provisions of article 7, which I have already quoted, when this program and method of execution shall have been decided by the league, the United States and the other members will be bound to conform to the same. I will call attention in a moment to the manner in which they will be bound and what the penalty will be if they undertake in any way to evade the decree of the league in fixing the size of their armies and navies.

Much unrelated irrelevant matter is contained in these—and I may say this without disparagement of any person at all—loosely drawn, vague, and uncertain articles. The principles just stated, however, are unequivocally expressed. Undoubtedly a reduction of armaments of the world is most desirable. With equal certainty, however, in deciding upon the terms of this disarmament the United States and its people should have the opportunity to ratify or reject the proposed plan, and the relative degree of such disarmament when so agreed to should be universal among all the nations of the world and should not be confined merely to

members of the league. It would be a curious proposition for all the members of this league to enforce peace to disband their armies and navies and to leave the great military nations which are not members of the league to build up a colossal military power; and yet that may be done. If one great nation is free to maintain such armies and navies as it sees fit while the members of the league disarm, the very condition sought to be avoided—namely, the temptation of conquest—would be accentuated. Under these provisions the decision as to the relative reduction of the Army and Navy of the United States, in proportion to that of great rival powers, would be taken absolutely out of the jurisdiction of the people and Government of the United States and vested in the jurisdiction of the league, where the United States has but one vote amid a large number of alien powers. Even a majority of these powers, many of whose interests are in conflict with those of the United States and whose traditions are entirely different, whose sympathies and predilections are subject to a wholly different environment, would determine this vital matter.

Mr. President, these provisions constitute a delegation and transfer of sovereign powers to an alien agency. These powers are vested by the Constitution of the United States in Congress. They can not be constitutionally divested.

It is argued by some that Congress, by accepting the arrangement made by the league of nations and making it its own, would thereby preserve its constitutional powers. I have heard that argued by Senators who are able lawyers. There is a good deal of speciousness in the argument, and yet it is entirely sophistical. The answer to that is perfectly obvious, that, if we keep the agreement which we make binding upon us as a Nation, under this league of nations Congress will not be left any discretion whatever to determine whether it will accept the decree of disarmament provided by the league, but it is bound and obligated in advance by the constitution of the league itself to have no other army and no other navy except that which is provided by the executive council of the league of nations.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. Does not that same objection apply to every treaty which the United States makes with any other nation?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not know that I thoroughly understand the Senator's question. The same subject matter, of course, is not involved in every other treaty; it is involved in very few.

Mr. NORRIS. If I may be permitted, I will try to make myself plainer. Suppose in the regular way the United States Government enters into a treaty with a foreign nation. It will require legislation, perhaps, to give it effect; it will require appropriations, and the legislation and the appropriations must come before Congress under the Constitution of the United States. Congress may fail, it may refuse to carry it out, even though the Government has made the agreement. The same thing would apply to this league, would it not? If there was required to carry it out some action upon the part of Congress, Congress, of course, could refuse to take the action, just as it could in the case of a treaty, and thus violate the agreement.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, in the first place, the matters the Senator has in mind in other treaties are specific programs which are defined by the treaty-making power of the Nation. I said a moment ago in my discussion of this matter that if a disarmament program were specified and submitted to the treaty-making power of the United States, so that this Government would have an opportunity of using its discretion as to whether it was a wise or an equal or a well-balanced relative disarmament, comparing our own Army and Navy with the armies and navies of other nations of the world, it would be a very different proposition. There is a great gulf between that and the delegation of unlimited power to a foreign tribunal to fix such a program of disarmament as it sees fit without any specification whatever.

Mr. NORRIS. Is not that a difference only in degree and not in principle? For instance, suppose that, instead of those powers which the Senator is criticizing in this proposed constitution being general, they were specific, and specifically defined the standing Army and the Navy that the United States, for instance, would be allowed to maintain, still Congress could go ahead and disregard all that if it desired to do so, for, after all, this is going to be nothing but a treaty, and we could raise a larger Army or a larger Navy or a smaller one and thus violate the agreement.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not agree with the Senator that it is a difference in degree only. I can see with perfect clarity a distinction of principle between a general, universal, unlimited



discretion and a limited and a specific program. I think there is a very marked distinction in principle between them.

Now, as to the Senator's statement that, after all, this is but a treaty, that is true; but it is a treaty adopting a constitution. It is true, as the Senator says, that Congress can ignore it; but, of course, if we are going on that theory there is no use in any discussion; we need not concern ourselves about this matter at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no, Mr. President; if the Senator will permit me, I am not going on the theory that we are going to violate our word. I only call attention to it because that is what we could do in the case of any treaty we have ever entered into since the beginning of the Government; we could violate it if we wanted to do so, and we could violate it under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I realize that fact. The Supreme Court of the United States has often decided that a treaty has no higher sanction than an act of Congress. There has been some confusion on the subject; but the law of the case is that they are on the same plane, and that the one which prevails is the one which is last in point of time. An act of Congress may be modified by a subsequent treaty, and a treaty may be modified by a subsequent act of Congress. But, Mr. President, we assume that we are going to live up to our obligations. We can violate the Constitution of the United States; I think we do, sometimes; but that does not in any degree lessen the importance of the Constitution. The care with which its provisions were framed was none the less because of the realization of the wise judges of human nature who were its authors and creators that not all men would observe its provisions. This constitution for the world is on exactly the same basis. The only basis upon which it can be discussed before the American people is that the American people are people of their word; that they will keep their agreement; and they ought not to be bound by an agreement made on their behalf that they can not and will not observe. We assume, in discussing this instrument, that when we attach the seal of the Government to it, it is binding upon the Government and upon the people of the United States. In order to escape its provisions, the only avenue is the avenue of dishonor and repudiation; and that is what we are seeking to avoid.

This is not an agreement for a specific program. On the contrary, it is the constitution of an alien tribunal, and a vesting of that tribunal with jurisdiction to make a program of disarmament in such degree, with such relations and proportions among the several nations as to the several elements of army and navy, as the league of nations in its judgment may determine; and the United States never will have an opportunity to pass judgment upon the question of whether or not the plan that is adopted is vital to the interests of the United States.

The situation would be wholly different from an agreement by treaty providing for a specific program of disarmament, agreed to through the constitutional agencies of the United States. It is clearly a delegation of powers of the Government of the United States to another power. We have had debates here as to whether or not the establishment of the Interstate Commerce Commission, for instance, and giving it power to regulate railroad rates, was or was not under the terms of the law a delegation of legislative power; and the rule has been laid down that if Congress fixes the measure by which the rates are to be determined, then the commission is a mere agent of Congress; but if we should establish a commission and say to that commission, "You take the power vested by the Constitution in Congress to regulate commerce between the States and operate under it in your discretion," there is not a lawyer in this body who would claim that such an act would be valid. Yet that is an exact parallel to the unlimited, general, universal power over armaments conveyed or attempted to be delegated by the Government of the United States to the league of nations by this constitution. If undertaken, it would be a surrender by the Government of the most essential, vital rights of the people, and of attributes of sovereignty involving the Nation's capacity to take such steps as it sees fit for the safeguarding and defense of its honor and vital interests. It is clearly a delegation of the powers of the Government of the United States to another power, and as such is beyond the capacity of the Government of the United States to enter into.

I will cite some authorities upon that proposition in a moment. The Government can not destroy itself. The trust of government is for the maintenance and protection of the Government. No Government can transfer its powers to some other Government over which it has no control. That is what is attempted to be done by this constitution of a league of nations.

It may be said, of course—and this answers the suggestion made, at least in one aspect, by the Senator from Nebraska—that notwithstanding the obligations of the constitution of the

league of nations, Congress may do as it sees fit. That, of course, raises the question as to the enforcement by the league of its decrees. See whether or not Congress can do as it sees fit. See what would be the result, under this constitution of the league of nations, if Congress undertakes to do what it sees fit after this constitution has been adopted. Read the constitution of the league and find out what the consequences will be. You may have the right to put on paper some other program, but what would be the result? The result would be that you would be then in a state of war with every other member of the league, and every other member of the league would have a right to use its military power to coerce Congress and the United States into the observance of the terms of the league.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to repeat, so that the Senator will not misunderstand me, that I do not want to be put in the attitude of advocating the theory that we should go into this proposition and then violate it; but I have called attention to that merely to show to the Senator, to my mind, that under the Constitution the same objection that he is making to this proposal exists in principle as to every treaty that the United States has ever entered into. Suppose we had a treaty with England that required the payment of money and Congress refused to appropriate and did not carry it out, it might result in war with England. If, with England, France and Spain and Holland were interested, it might result in war with them. If we make this agreement and then refuse to carry it out or refuse to obey it, we may still get into war. I concede that.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is not a question of "may," Mr. President. The language of the constitution of the league of nations is that—

Mr. NORRIS. That we would.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That, ipso facto, it shall be deemed to be an act of war.

Mr. NORRIS. And if we go into it and do not comply with our agreement, we ought to get into trouble.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think myself that if we go into it we ought to get into trouble, and we will get into trouble. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. The history of the world has shown that we have gotten into a good deal of trouble by staying out. We are just getting out of one of the big troubles now.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is a pretty good policy to apply right here to stay out, keep out, attend to our own business, and let other nations attend to theirs, follow the advice of Washington and the practice of Lincoln, stick by the old, tried traditions of the Government that generations have demonstrated to be wise, and be cautious about throwing them into the discard and accepting some untried nostrum to settle all the affairs of the world for all time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator permit me to make this observation, in view of the observation made by the Senator from Nebraska that we have gotten into trouble:

Europe has had about 100 wars in the last century, and we got into just one of them. When you get through with your little league of nations, if Europe should have a hundred wars we would be a party to all of them.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it ought to be said, at least, that it is the theory of those who advocate this league of nations that Europe will not have a hundred wars. I may be wrong, and we may be wrong, but it is the object of this league to avoid those wars.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It has pretty nearly that many wars now raging. That is somewhat hyperbolic, but it has quite a number of wars going on at the present time.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wanted to suggest to the Senator from Washington, in view of the remark of the Senator from Nebraska, that I do not think anybody will claim that the denunciation, as it is called, of a treaty is an act of war or can be considered as a just cause for war of itself. Everybody admits that in the case of any treaty that we make, after the circumstances and conditions surrounding the subject matter have changed and it becomes unsatisfactory to this country, Congress may denounce the treaty and say that we will not be bound by it any longer, but that that ever was construed as an act of war. I do not think was ever claimed before by anyone.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not claim that, Mr. President. That was not my claim.



Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well. Then, the Senator, it seems to me, should not claim that the violation of this proposed league-of-nations condition is at all on a parity with a mere denouncement of an existing treaty.

Mr. NORRIS. No; Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, the Senator was calling attention to what we would have to do, what the league could require of us, and if we did not do it we would be in war with the other nations under the league. I concede that under the league that might happen.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I know; but the Senator from Nebraska, unless I entirely missed the point he was attempting to make, was contending that we are in the same position now if we denounce a treaty, and that therefore it would be no worse for us to go into a league of nations than it is to make a treaty with a nation.

Mr. NORRIS. No; the Senator from Connecticut, I think, failed to get the idea I wanted to convey. That is, in meeting the point made by the Senator from Washington that this is an unconstitutional proposition, that we are surrendering some of our sovereignty, my contention is that we never did enter into a treaty since the beginning of the Government but that the Congress—even the House of Representatives alone, not a part of the treaty-making power—might destroy the treaty and refuse to carry it out.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I am compelled to decline to yield for debate between other Senators, notwithstanding it is conducted with all good intentions, because it goes on indefinitely and destroys ultimately the continuity of the argument I am attempting to make. In view of what the Senator has said, if he will pardon me, I will say in this connection that the distinction is between a valid treaty and an invalid treaty. The treaties to which the Senator has referred are assumed to be valid treaties. Now, the argument here is whether or not this treaty is valid. There never has been a treaty in the history of the Government under which we undertook to delegate the power of the Government to any other power. There have been many treaties which bound the Government as to its international affairs; but there never was another treaty in the history of this country, or, so far as I am informed, in the recent history of the world—there have been some, the Achaean League, the Holy Alliance, and others, in former times, all of which proved to be utter failures—but there is no parallel whatever in the history of the United States for the transfer or delegation by the Government of the United States to another tribunal, not of the power to do a specific thing but of the right to assume the unlimited powers of Government within the sphere of its jurisdiction of the subject matters which are defined in this constitution.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Has the Senator forgotten the treaty between the United States and Great Britain regarding armaments upon the waters between Canada and the United States?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; I have not forgotten it. There is nothing whatever in that treaty that in any way is in conflict with the statement I have just made. There is not any international tribunal determining upon a limitation of armaments between this country and Canada.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In that case the United States and Great Britain mutually agreed as to the armaments and naval preparations on those waters?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The United States gave up its right to put naval armament upon those waters and—

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator evidently has not been listening to what I have been saying.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; I have been listening quite closely.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator listened closely, he heard me concede that not only would it be legal but it would be desirable if the various nations of the world could get together, as the United States and Great Britain did in the case of our Canadian border, and agree upon a reduction of armaments. I said that that was what we should have done; and the case which the Senator from Nebraska has cited to dispute the argument which I have made is a demonstration of its soundness. It is exactly parallel to what I claim we should do in this case.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator has been asserting that the legislative power of Congress could not be restricted with regard to armaments; and the treaty to which I refer is a direct restriction upon the power of Congress as to armaments.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Not at all, Mr. President. I will yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania in just a moment. The Senator from Nebraska entirely misapprehends what I said. What I said was that the discretion vested by the Constitution in Congress to determine the extent of the armament of the United States could not be delegated to another tribunal. I did not say that under the Constitution of the United States a certain reduction of armament, or entire disarmament, specified in a treaty could not be made the supreme law of the land.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOX. I merely want to call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to the fact that the treaty to which he refers, between the United States and Great Britain, has relation to a boundary line between the two countries, and anything relating to a boundary line is always a matter of mutual agreement, and it is no precedent for any other thing than a boundary-line treaty.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The President of the United States has said in the speech which he made to the peace congress in vindication of this constitution of a league of nations that force is in the background; but he said it is in the background. In other words, there is a statement of the chief advocate of the constitution of a league of nations that unequivocally and ultimately the execution of this constitution is based not upon decrees or statutes but upon force.

Should Congress refuse to obey the mandate of the league in this respect, then the United States would be subject to coercion by this force so defined by the President. Furthermore, the United States would be subject to the discredit and shame of a violation of a compact solemnly entered into with other nations. This will inevitably be the result in the face of any vital emergency affecting the independence or safety of a high-spirited people such as ours. They will act as they see fit in vital emergencies, both as to raising armies, maintaining navies, and as to the compulsory arbitration of nonjusticiable questions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 14078) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The nations should avoid entering into an agreement which can not be kept, which compromises the interests of the people and subjects them to the shame of an inevitable repudiation of ill-advised, unwise, and unconstitutional agreements.

There should be a common-sense plan among all of the great military powers for a reduction and limitation of armament; but this plan should be specifically worked out in advance of its acceptance. It should be submitted to the Government and to the people of the United States for their approval or rejection; and, when approved, there should be an express reservation of the right of the people of the United States to abrogate the agreement upon due notice and due procedure. This blind commitment of the people to submit their future to the decision of a tribunal in which the United States is only one voice in a multitude, without limitation as to what its decision shall be, or any provision whatever for its discussion, acceptance, rejection, modification, or abrogation under any circumstances by the people, would be a betrayal of the trust and heritage of the Nation. It would mean the end of the high station which both as citizens and as a Republic we have occupied heretofore in the world.

The provisions of the constitution for compulsory arbitration of every question or dispute are contained in articles 12, 13, 15, 16, and 17. These contain many conflicting provisions. There is much repetition. The provisions are loosely expressed, indefinite, and uncertain, but in this mass of undigested and conflicting matter there is contained the indubitable provision for compulsory arbitration of every controversy, whatever its vital nature may be, even though it involve the integrity, honor, or essential interests of the Nation.

Article 12 provides—

The high contracting parties agree that should disputes arise between them which can not be adjusted by the ordinary processes of diplomacy, they will in no case resort to war without previously submitting the questions and matters involved either to arbitration or to inquiry by the executive council, and until three months after the award by the arbitrators or a recommendation by the executive council, and that they



will not even then resort to war as against a member of the league which complies with the award of the arbitrators, or the recommendation of the executive council.

I suppose the construction given to these various conflicting methods in these different articles would be that they are concurrent, and that it was left to the discretion of the members of the league to adopt one or the other, of course all being equally binding, and article 12, which I have just enunciated, compelling the arbitration of every question as I have already stated, they would all be equal in effect, in so far as they were concurrent and so far as all could be given effect.

Articles 13 and 15 provide entirely different and conflicting rules of arbitration, but do not in any way modify or suspend article 12, just stated. It is unfortunate that such an ambitious document as the proposed constitution of the world should be so loosely and more or less incoherently drawn. But, taking it as it is, the question to be decided in its adoption is whether or not the American people, in a great and vital emergency, such as many times confronted them in the past, will surrender their power of ultimate decision as to the course to be taken and give over in advance their freedom of action in the defense of the Nation. It is true there is contained in another article a provision against "external aggression of territorial integrity and existing political independence of all States members of the league." But slaughter of American citizens, invasion of American rights absolutely essential to the maintenance of the Nation, have often occurred without an invasion of territory or an attack upon political independence. This was the case in the war conducted against us on the sea by Germany, and in the brutal murder of our citizens and the confiscation of their property in Mexico. The destruction of our fleet and the control of our sea routes by an enemy power would not come within either of these exceptions.

I want to pause to say these are not exceptions to compulsory arbitration, but simply provisions that in the two cases mentioned the other members of the league agree to protect the interests of all.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield for a question.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator intend to discuss later on the effect of the clause he has just referred to in reference to the preservation of the integrity of the domain of nations?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes; I intend to discuss that, and to call attention to another effect of it.

Mr. REED. Then I do not desire now to anticipate the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Controversies in regard to immigration on the Pacific coast, or elsewhere; of naturalization; of alien ownership of land, neither involve political independence nor territorial aggression; and yet, under this provision, we are required to submit them all to the decision of a tribunal the great overwhelming majority of which is composed of aliens to our interests and institutions.

So as to the Monroe doctrine, when a threat was made to infringe upon it in Venezuela—once in the administration of Cleveland and once in that of Roosevelt. Neither of the conditions just stated were involved, and yet these were attacks upon a fundamental essential policy of the Nation, which ought not to be and can not be—if we are true to the trust which we have received from Cleveland and Roosevelt; and from Washington and from Monroe—transferred to the control of a league of nations or any tribunal established by it. It should remain under the control of the American people.

During all of this stupendous proceeding upon which for weeks and months the attention of the world has been concentrated for the devising of means to prevent future wars and establish universal and perpetual peace, wars and military operations have been in progress; and it is permissible to inquire whether the machinery here proposed would have prevented them, or was necessary to enable the United States to maintain peace. Was the league of nations necessary to enable the United States to preserve peace instead of war in Haiti, or in San Domingo, or in Honduras? Was a league of nations essential to enable the United States to preserve peace when it took Vera Cruz, or when it made war upon Villa in northern Mexico? Furthermore, if a league of nations had been in existence at the time, would it have furnished any resources not already available to the United States for the settlement of the Mexican question and for the preservation of peace between Mexico and the United States? Certainly, so far as force is concerned, the power of the United States as compared with Haiti, or San Domingo, or Mexico, or Honduras, is sufficient to put into operation the humane impulses which are to be gratified by the league of na-

tions; and it is difficult to see what element of value in the establishment of universal and perpetual peace in these countries would be provided by a league of nations not already possessed by the United States to compensate us for the obligations which we are asked to assume in the league by adding to our cares the protection of the territorial integrity of the several members of the league, and the guardianship of the moral, spiritual, and physical well-being of "peoples of central Africa." Furthermore, will the league of nations bring peace to Russia? There is already a league of nations, whose representatives are sitting in Paris along with their associate, the United States. We have not thought enough of this league to join it, but have taken great pains to differentiate ourselves from it, under the name of an associate power; while we have agitated for a league of a different kind, although up to the time of the publication within the last few days of the proposed constitution of the league no explanation was given as to wherein it would differ from the existing league. This existing league has been powerful enough to overcome the greatest monster that ever appeared among the nations—unregenerate Germany, which has been brought to her knees.

If this league has been so diverted from its purposes and so preoccupied in seeking for a permanent and universal league, for the establishment of future peace, that it has not been able to restore present peace, or set up orderly government in central Europe and in Russia, can we expect the proposed future league to accomplish more?

It is not going to be any more powerful than the present one. Why should we expect there is going to be some mysterious virtue in it by which it will do what the present alliance of the righteous nations of the world has failed to do?

If civilized and righteous mankind, organized as it is, acting with a governmental unity never before achieved, has not been able to bring peace in Europe or stop the war which is raging around its feet, can we expect that, as a compensation for the surrender of sovereignty proposed by this constitution, the league for which it provides will establish universal and perpetual peace in the future? On the contrary, with the additional obligations and complications of interest which it will create, will it not multiply the occasions for war? The test of intention is action. Benevolence is best displayed by conduct. The expression of "humane impulses" and of ardent desire for the future good of mankind must be judged by present performance. If the present welfare of the world, including our own people and our own soldiers who are garrisoning occupied territory in Europe, is neglected in the face of the threat of class war and of the existence of international war, can we give credence to protestations of interest in its future welfare? While talking of perpetual peace our voice is drowned in the clamors of war.

Article 10, Mr. President, of this constitution binds the United States as one of the contracting parties to undertake to "preserve," quoting from the instrument, "as against external aggressions the territorial integrity and existing political independence in all States members of the league." This is somewhat ungrammatical but its meaning and intention is perfectly obvious.

The next sentence authorizes the executive council "to advise upon the means by which the obligation shall be fulfilled."

Mr. REED. The Senator has reached the point about which I rose to ask him a question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield for a question.

Mr. REED. Is it the Senator's opinion that under the terms of this league if Ireland was to conclude to set up a separate government it would be a part of the duty of the United States to furnish troops to assist Great Britain in suppressing Ireland?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. REED. Now, assume that Canada was to conclude that she wanted to set up a separate government and no longer be controlled by Great Britain, would it not likewise be our duty to furnish soldiers to cross the Canadian line to suppress Canadian patriots who might be undertaking to establish an independent republic on this continent?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, under other articles of this constitution the United States is compelled to take an interest, and the degree and the extent of the interest is undefined, in a war or a threatened war anywhere in the world. So far as the particular language which I just quoted is concerned, and to which the Senator is referring, I should judge, while I stand here on my feet, not having considered the question before, that there would be some question as to the recognition by the Government of the United States of the independence of Canada or of Ireland before we could determine what the obligation of this Government would be in that case under this language.



Another question that would arise would be whether or not the operations of Ireland or of Canada threatened the political independence or constituted an aggression upon the territorial integrity of Great Britain.

Mr. REED. Let me ask another question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIMBY in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield for a question.

Mr. REED. To my mind this is one of the most interesting points in the matter. Let us assume that Russia is organized again under the old autocratic Government, that Poland has been erected as an independent republic, and that a portion of Russia—Russia having been admitted into the league—would want to join Poland and become a part of the Polish Republic, and Poland was to undertake to permit that and to assist in it, that, of course, would be an invasion of the territorial rights of the Russian autocrat. Would not that be a case where it would be plainly our duty, as guarantors against external aggression, to join the Russian autocrat to crush the Russian revolutionists and the Polish Republic?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is not any limit to the combinations of circumstances which can be conceived as entirely possible, and many of them inevitably arising in the future affairs of mankind, in which the United States would be bound to intervene under the language of the constitution which I have just cited. The instances which the Senator from Missouri has suggested are very pertinent and illustrate and illuminate the potentialities of trouble, the probabilities of trouble under these provisions.

Mr. REED. I should like to ask the Senator one further question. Has he compared this particular clause with a similar clause in the Holy Alliance? If he has not, I would like to hand it to him at the proper time.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have not. It is said by some that this is not an entangling alliance. Some of the advocates of a league of nations have gotten into such a transcendental plane of logic that I have been unable to follow them. They have said that the Monroe doctrine is not affected. I always thought the Monroe doctrine was an American doctrine to be administered by America, and that was one of its essential elements. They propose to transfer its administration to Europe and say it is not affected at all. I have never quite understood the process of thought by which they arrive at that conclusion.

Another very ethereal and difficult—sublimated, as the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] suggests to me—process of reasoning is the assertion that the obligation which we here enter into by this constitution, if it is adopted, to defend every member of the league in all parts of the world and to assume the guardianship of unknown and undesigned peoples of Africa and elsewhere is not an entangling alliance. They seem to argue in some way which I am not able to understand that if you carry on the process of entanglement far enough you finally get to a point where it is not entanglement.

The fact of the case is, Mr. President, that, looking at it from the standpoint that I think the American citizens look at it, the everyday man on the street, the way I look at it, from a common-sense standpoint, no such colossal burden or entangling alliance was ever before conceived in the world, not only in the United States but in the world at large.

Under this obligation the United States assumes, if it is adopted, the protection of every nation which shall become a member of the league. In this we would have the cooperation of other members who were willing and able to fulfill their obligations under this article, but, whether acting jointly with them or alone, or with such of them as would live up to their obligations, the United States would be bound to tax its people and sacrifice its soldiers to make war in behalf of every foreign country, member of the league, when attacked in the manner indicated, either by a member or by a nonmember nation. No such colossal burden or entangling alliance was ever before conceived in the world. Instead of being an instrument of peace it is the fertile seed of war—the dragon's teeth from which, when sown, armed soldiers will spring.

Article 19 places upon the United States the further burden of the joint guardianship with the other members of the league of "colonies and territories which, as a consequence of the late war, have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves," of "certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish monarchy," and "other peoples, especially those of central Africa." The further scope of this guardianship, to which the United States pledges itself by this article, is unlimited and undefined and presumably would be left to the unlimited and undefined discretion of the league

of nations. The extent to which this guardianship shall be delegated to a "mandatory state" as agent is left entirely in the discretion of the league.

That means that the degree of responsibility of the guardian nation to be directly exercised by the league itself is left in the discretion of the league. How much responsibility shall be assumed by the mandatory state it is not for us to determine. It is for the league to determine, and when determined by the league we become responsible for it.

The article states—

The degree of authority, control, or administration to be exercised by the mandatory state shall, if not previously agreed upon by the high contracting parties in each case, be explicitly defined by the executive council in a special act or charter.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. LODGE. I want to ask a question to get the Senator's construction. Perhaps he has given it. Does the Senator find that there is anything that tells us whether being appointed a mandatory is compulsory or can it be refused by the nation selected as a mandatory without violating the treaty?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is nothing in the constitution expressly fixing a rule upon that subject. In my opinion the necessary construction of the instrument is that when a nation is designated by the decree of the league, then that decree is upon the same basis as the other decrees of the league, and the nation has no discretion and can not refuse to assume the responsibility.

Mr. LODGE. That is the conclusion I came to; but, of course, like most of the others, it requires a good many vigorous inferences.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think after these various examinations, which are quite necessary, have been made you will find, after all, that where there is a provision that the league can designate one of the nations as a mandatory, and there is nothing else on the subject, the implication is perfectly plain that there is no discretion left in the mandatory itself. In other words, it would require an express provision to enable a member of the league to refuse to obey an order made by the league.

As to these various peoples of the world, for whose future welfare we would thus become responsible, the article states that "the mandatory must be responsible (to the league) for the administration of the territory, subject to conditions which will guarantee freedom of conscience or religion, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, the prohibition of abuses, such as the slave trade, the arms traffic, and the liquor traffic." Other obligations in addition to these are also stated. Not satisfied with the service to mankind, greater than all others, which has been rendered by the establishment of a government without class, with equal opportunity, and subject to the control of the people, in the United States, and with that protection which we have extended under the Monroe doctrine to other nations in the Western Hemisphere, we thus undertake, practically unsolicited and unsought, to extend our responsibilities and cares into the uttermost parts of the earth. The expense, labor, and sacrifice of life which will be the direct result of the performance of such an obligation on the part of the United States are past calculation. The indirect injury, however, to the spirit of our Government in thus assuming, along with others, a despotism, however benevolent we may conceive it now to be, over large portions of the world is far more sinister than the losses which we will inevitably suffer directly in men and money. It is an insidious menace, undermining the principles of the localization of government, of nationality, and substituting for them the principle of despotic internationalism, in which the self-determination of all peoples will be merged.

Correspondingly, while assuming obligations of government in Asia, Africa, and Europe, this article, at once, by the same terms, surrenders to Asia, Africa, and Europe American policies which have been the prize jewels in the American diadem of state. Emergencies which have arisen in the past may arise in the future. The expulsion of Maximilian from Mexico, the protection of Venezuela from Germany and Great Britain, the freeing of Cuba from the despotism and cruelty of Spain under Lincoln, Roosevelt, Cleveland, and McKinley, in pursuance of the famous policy of Monroe, would have been impossible under a league of nations. All of these issues instead of being decided by the United States, in the light of the high ideals of these traditional doctrines would be left to the administration of an alien tribunal, established under the league of nations.

What the outcome would be no man can tell. Whatever it would be, it would be the decision which at the time corresponded with the motives and beliefs of the majority of the foreign members of the tribunal. This, of course, means the end and obsequies of American determination and control of these matters.



The Monroe doctrine is an American doctrine. If its administration is transferred to the congregated nations of the Old World, it ceases to be a Monroe doctrine. Its application, construction, and existence would then be dependent upon the mercy of the very nations against whose interests it was promulgated. Its fate can easily be foreseen.

I have in my desk verified, detailed statements of continuing outrages upon Americans lawfully in Mexico—the murder of our citizens and the confiscation and looting of their property. For six years we have allowed this, in one form or another, to proceed. It is to be presumed that some day the self-respect and honor of the American people in these matters will be protected by their Government. However, if the constitution of the league of nations is adopted, our Government will have surrendered forever its power to protect its citizens in Mexico and will have committed them unequivocally to the judgment and discretion of the other nations of the world. Our citizens may continue to be the victims of Mexican disorder, and their blood will cry in vain to their country for help. There can be no help, for the power to protect its citizens—the chief and primary function of government—will have been transferred to another.

Surely the "humane impulses" of the administration can be exercised in the performance of our obligations toward the small countries of the Caribbean and of Mexico by the most powerful Nation in the world without the aid of a league of nations. If we have tears to shed over the woes of mankind, we can shed them without stint, and are free to put into effect at will such measures as our benevolence may dictate within the traditional sphere of our influence. If we desire perpetual peace in America—and by that I mean in all the Americas—do we need a league of nations to enforce it? Have we not already in the union of the States, each one built from the sacrifices and toil and from the brains and courage of its inhabitants, a league of nations amply able to guarantee such peace in the western world as our people may deem wise and just?

The purpose of the league is stated to be universal and perpetual peace. The question to be determined by the American people is whether the establishment of these additional obligations and interests will not inevitably make for war where heretofore we have been able in the exercise of our sovereignty and under the benevolent policies of our country to preserve peace. Furthermore, there are some prices that are too high to be paid even for peace. Our fathers could have had peace in 1776 at the price of liberty, but they chose war and were aroused by Henry's cry, "Is peace so sweet or life so dear as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?" They could have had peace in 1860 by the sacrifice of the Union, but they chose war, war without measure, to save that Union which was the palladium of free institutions.

Who can say that the sacrifices of any of the heroes who fell for the preservation of the Union in the North were too great a price to pay for the countless blessings which have come to their children and to the world, bought with their blood? We could have had peace in 1898, when the anguished cry of helpless Cuba, ground under the cruelties of Weyler, fell upon our ears. But we chose war, and who can say that the freeing of these people upon our immediate borders from tyranny and persecution and the establishment of security, industry, and order was not worth the price we paid? We could have had peace in 1917 by supinely surrendering our rights upon the high seas and abandoning the trade and commerce of our people, essential not only to prosperity but to national existence. Had we been willing to follow the advice of pacifists and take the coward's part of servile submission to the orders of a monster among the nations, to betray the trust of Government and leave our murdered citizens unavenged, there would have been no immediate war. But our Government in its essential functions would have been ultimately destroyed, because its essential function is the protection of the honor, the lives, and the rights of its citizens.

France might have had peace in the fateful days of August, 1914, when her soil was invaded and her homes devastated by the Huns, if she had been willing to pay the price. That price would have been slavery of her people, the destruction of her civilization, and with it the civilization of the world, but, to the honor of France, she chose war.

In the search for universal and perpetual peace those who advocate it at any price make no distinction between the war of conquest and lust of Germany and the holy and righteous war of defense of France. On the contrary, both now and at all times through the war, the principal advocates of peace at any price seemed rather to favor the cause of Germany than that of our own country and its allies. They seem now to be desirous of saving the vandals of devastated France and Belgium from retributive justice. Instead of peace by the victory of the allies they seemed to favor a peace of submission to the conquest of the Huns.

If their views had prevailed, the great principle of the protection of our rights and the lives of our citizens from violent aggression would have been abandoned. Germany, perhaps, would have triumphed in Europe, and, having consolidated the resources of her enemies there, would have carried her campaign of conquest to our shores. Who except the pacifists and those who then favored peace at any price can say that we should have made such a poltroon peace? Who except the cowards that would seek safety in nonresistance can say that the victorious war which we waged with our allies was not wiser than the inevitable war which we would later have been compelled to wage unaided if we had remained neutral while Germany absorbed the resources of France and England and consolidated them to her purposes? Universal and perpetual peace is much to be desired, but only when it can be obtained in honor and without the surrender of the vital interests of the Nation. Furthermore, there are occasions when the vital interests and honor of the Nation are not immediately involved, but when plans and movements are being set afoot for purposes of aggression which, if not checked, will inevitably menace both honor and safety, when wisdom dictates that such movements shall be checked in the beginning—by war, if necessary, as a last resort—rather than to allow the menace to develop to such proportion as will call for greater sacrifices in the end.

The national liberty of action to determine and carry out these policies is the most essential attribute of national sovereignty. All this would be surrendered by the constitution of the league of nations, and the destinies of the American people in all such crises would be taken from their own control and vested in the league. It can not be done, at least, in silence. It must be known, and the American people must be advised of this proposed surrender of their liberties.

It is a curious circumstance, Mr. President, that the South—and I speak of it as one of the South—which failed in its great effort for independence in 1865, having obtained control of the Government of the Union, now is about to achieve the sardonic triumph of depriving the North of its independence and setting up over it a supergovernment. The North conquered the South by force of arms; the South now seems to be in a fair way of conquering the North by a diplomatic surrender of its liberties. The South having fought the most heroic war, in many respects, in history, and having lost and been subjected to the domination of the North, now apparently has no objection to go still further and subject both the South and the North to the control of an international government. It would, indeed, be a sardonic triumph. Will the North agree to this extension of the idea of the Union to include the alien nations of the Old World? The Union, as it was idealized by Lincoln, was not only in its essence the federation of the States, but, equally as important, it was the sovereignty and independence of the United States. Without sovereignty and independence the Union of the States loses its soul and becomes a mere piece of machinery. It was for the independence and sovereignty of the States that Washington gave himself, and whose achievement placed him at the very pinnacle of human greatness. To surrender that now would be to destroy the living work of all of our mighty dead. To now place in the hands of the council of the league of nations, all but one foreigners, nearly all of them speaking an alien language, born and bred to different traditions, accustomed to a diverse environment, with different ideals and varying interests and motives, that control over the sovereign action of the American people for which so many of our precious heroes have labored would be as though it were a pitiful murder of the very soul of our fathers in their own house, builded by their hands. It would be in its result the same thing as treason, because it would be a transfer of allegiance.

The most active advocates of this transfer of ultimate control of our most cherished rights to a foreign tribunal tell us—and this is one of the most frequent arguments—that we need fear nothing, for we will have friends among the other representatives on the tribunal who will protect our interests and sympathize with our aspirations. This, in itself, is a confession of the betrayal of the great trust of government, because it is a confession that the decision of these matters, instead of depending upon the American people themselves determining their own fate, depends upon the friendship or benevolence of an alien tribunal. No doubt the American people could have depended upon the wisdom, disinterestedness, loyalty, and honor of Washington. No other in human affairs has ever been more to be trusted. It was suggested by some that he be given a crown, but the sons of liberty, though they loved Washington and trusted him without limit, realized the immortal principle that liberty is too precious a thing to be trusted to the power of any man or set of men. And so it was that they denied this power even to Washington and vested it in the representatives of the people, under the people's control, subject to



the people's retirement, and set up a Constitution which is a model of checks and balances, by which the powers of government are divided, one department balancing another, and various procedures operating as checks upon each other. Many despots have been benevolent, and some of them loved their people, and yet they ruled as despots. Have the American people come to the point when, as confessed by the advocates of the league of nations, who say that in various contingencies we can depend upon the good will of the alien members of the league—they say we can depend upon the friendship of the Anglo-Saxon members of the league and others—but have we come to the point that we must submit our fate to the charity, to the good will, or to the benevolence of alien powers? That is what is proposed. Understandingly our people will not do it; and if they do so, it can not be binding upon their children. Those children, when they come into control of the affairs of the Nation, when emergencies arise, will repudiate the surrender of their liberties, assert their ancient rights, even though at the price of war. This is inevitable, and the vice of such an obligation is that it leads to repudiation, to dishonor, and to war, although it is done in the name of high ideals and perpetual and universal peace.

Mr. President, the powers vested in the league of nations by this constitution necessarily must be exercised by men. If we may suppose that the men who will first be chosen to act for the nations upon this league will be both good and wise, and that we can trust our great policies of state, of peace, security, and the honor of the United States in their hands, what guaranty can the advocates of the league give us that the changing personnel of its council, or its delegates, or a majority of them, will continue to be wise, benevolent, charitable, or humane? Good and great men have been scarce in the history of the world; and why should we assume that the league will be dominated only by the good and the great? The teachings of statesmen in the past have been to subject the officials of government to rule and to law, for the very reason that the weaknesses of human nature can not be trusted with discretion and unlimited power. The constitution of the league of nations proposes an opposite principle, where the most comprehensive powers ever delegated to an official body are vested in a number of delegates and in an executive council without checks or balances or definite rules or limitations; where the legislative, executive, and judicial power over the world is consolidated in a single body of men, with no rules of procedure except such as they make for themselves, the wisdom of their action being left entirely to the people of conflicting interests, of varying degrees of intelligence and civilization of the several nations, and to the characters of the delegates they may choose. The history of the world shows that this dependence is frail and uncertain. Inevitably this unlimited discretion will be exercised in accordance with the motives, interests, environment, tradition, ideals of the constituted members of the league, and to this heterogeneous mass of controlling influences the destinies of America will be submitted. These destinies are now under the absolute, unrestricted, unlimited control of the people whose destinies they are and who, consequently, have no motive to betray—because it would be a betrayal of themselves—acting under the set and clearly limited rules established by the classic phrases of the Constitution of the United States.

Under the proposed loosely drawn, inconsistent, ill-defined constitution of the world these destinies will be submitted to the control of nations, however civilized, humane, and enlightened they may be, who have no personal, direct interest in our destinies, but who, on the contrary, have destinies of their own to guard, and in whose guardianship we admire them for looking out for the interests of their own people, which in many aspects are in direct opposition and conflict with our own.

The Government of the United States has no constitutional power to make a treaty transferring any of its sovereign powers to an alien tribunal. No treaty which takes from the various departments of the American Government, established by the Constitution, the jurisdiction therein conferred and transfers it to an extraconstitutional body, and particularly to an alien body, and particularly an alien body composed of foreign sovereign nations, is valid. Chief Justice Taney, in deciding the case of *Doe et al. v. Braden* (16 How., pp. 635-657), said:

The treaty is therefore a law made by the proper authority and the courts of justice have no right to annul or disregard any of its provisions unless they violate the Constitution of the United States.

Here is a clear implication that courts have the power to annul any treaty which violates the Constitution of the United States. The same views were expressed by Justice Swayne in the case of the Cherokee tobacco, Eleventh Wallace, page 616, where he said:

It need hardly be said that a treaty can not change the Constitution or be held valid if it be in violation of that instrument.

Also Justice Field expressed his views to the same effect in the case of *Geofroy v. Riggs* (133 U. S., 258), where he "declared," as stated by Second Butler, Treaty-Making Power, page 392:

That while the treaty-making power of the United States extended to all proper subjects of negotiation, and is in terms unlimited except by those restraints which are found in the instrument itself against the action of the Government, or of its departments, or from those arising from the nature of the Government itself and that of the States, it would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government, or in that of one of the States.

As stated by Prof. Woolsey:

The treaty-making power must be exercised for the purpose of preserving national life, and not for destroying it.

We are told by Mr. Wilson and Mr. Taft that the war in which we are now involved, and in which we do not seem to be able to make peace, was a crusade for the benefit of the world. We are told that we went to war, not for any selfish interests of our own, but for the benefit of mankind at large. Crusades and conscript armies do not go well together. Governments have no moral right to sacrifice the lives of their soldiers, and to levy compulsory taxes upon their people, merely to gratify a feeling of benevolence toward the world in general. This country, the people of the United States, would never have supported the war with Germany as they did, with such unanimity and heroism as they exhibited, upon any such basis of idealism as a crusade for the interests of the world at large. We went to war, and contributed of our substance and of our blood, to protect and defend the vital interests and ultimate independence of the United States itself, and no Government has a right to plunge its people into a war for any but a similar purpose.

It has been said that our soldiers in France were fighting for the 14 points, and yet every one of them that has ever been questioned on the subject was extremely doubtful as to what the 14 points were. The fact of the case is that the soldiers went to France because most of them were conscripted and drafted; and they exhibited there, with those that volunteered—and they were all eager in the service of the Nation—a heroism, in the face of a new species of warfare which the world had never before experienced, which added new glory to the already bright pages of American history. What were those men fighting for? Why, when they went into battle they went in with a cry, as though it were the shriek of some note of the Marseillaise, of "*Lusitania!*" They went into battle against the Germans because they were fighting for their country and their country's flag. Their object in that war was not to carry on a crusade, but it was to defeat the Germans.

Mr. President, there is an internationalism abroad in the land—an internationalism of the élite and an internationalism of the proletariat rampant.

There is internationalism at the top and internationalism at the bottom, and both are moving forward through different means and methods to the same destination. Germany is supporting both. The idealists and peace-at-any-price pacifists are approaching by one road. The Industrial Workers of the World and their Bolshevik allies throughout the world are approaching upon another. Both lead to the same destination—an international and despotic government of the world. Both involve the surrender of nationality and the setting up of a centralized despotism. It must be a despotism, because no government in whose discretion is centered the ultimate control of the affairs of the whole world can be free.

This movement is backed with great resources and ample funds. Such organizations as the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, endowed by a subject of Great Britain, with resources acquired in the United States, are among its most powerful supporters. These great organizations are able to employ, at high prices, influential lecturers, including even an ex-President of the United States.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do.

Mr. REED. I want to ask the Senator if we are to understand that statement literally?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Absolutely.

Mr. REED. That is, that ex-President Taft is under the pay of those organizations?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Such organizations as I have referred to.

The founder of the society which I have just mentioned—the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace—is an open advocate of the reunion of the United States with Great Britain—in fact, he has written a book on the subject—and of the amalgamation of our Government with the British Empire. The organization of a league to enforce peace is but an enlargement of this conception. It is the same principle and a part of the



same program. In a dispatch on yesterday from London it is truly stated:

The American and British viewpoints are totally different. America gets nothing out of the war except a large share of responsibility in world affairs, while Great Britain gets a powerful ally in the maintaining of peace. The British insist that America is morally forced to assume this responsibility.

Another explanation of the news that comes to us of the favoring of a league of peace by Europe, which no doubt is astounded that it is put forth by America.

I want to point out now what we are getting into.

Under the provisions of article 16 of the proposed constitution, upon any refusal on the part of the United States, as a member of the proposed league, to comply with the covenants of compulsory arbitration of all matters, as set forth in article 12, it "shall thereby ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all the other members of the league which hereby undertakes immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or official relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between other nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a member of the league or not." In other words, once we have entered into this fatal covenant, which contains no provision for our withdrawal from it, our failure to obey the decrees of the league, or of tribunals constituted under the terms of its constitution, automatically makes us an outcast and a pariah among the nations of the world, and plunges us into a state of war with all the other nations composing the league.

And yet this is the covenant that we are asked to make by a number of college professors, and by Miss Julia Lathrop and Miss Jane Addams—excellent women, who have done a devoted work in the world, deserving of the thanks and consideration and gratitude of our people, and yet who have not had any experience which qualifies them to frame a constitution for the government of the world.

This proposal is also advocated by a number of college presidents, one of whom a short time ago I noticed criticizing some remarks that I had made in the Senate in opposition to a league of nations which, by its advocates upon the floor, was compared with the Government of the United States, and that is a very favorite comparison of its advocates. They want to set up over the world a government such as that which our fathers set up over the States of the American Union, and subject our Nation to those powers which the Federal Government exercises over the States. This great college professor—I think it was the president of Harvard University—said that the constitution of a league of nations did not have anything more to do with the Monroe doctrine than it had to do with the price of sugar. He seemed to think that it did not have anything to do with the price of sugar, and that shows the impractical mind of many of the advocates of a league of nations. It has a great deal to do with the price of sugar, because the purpose of such a league is to prevent war, and the price of sugar is one of the most fertile causes of war. We had war in Cuba over the price of sugar. Sugar is one of the standard bases of food; and every war that the world ever saw, in its ultimate analysis, was based upon a controversy over the food of mankind. It has to do with the price of beans. If beans had been cheap and plentiful in Mexico, we would have been saved the war which has ravaged that unhappy land. Beans are one of the principal articles of their diet.

This college president said, however, that if these objections which were made to the proposed league of nations were valid, another one could be framed which would not be subject to the objections. Evidently he was accustomed, as so many college presidents are—I used to have an idea that they were all filled with the wisdom of Socrates—to hiring men who know things, like business managers of great business institutions. They have been so accustomed to being able to employ men who could teach the varied learning of the world that if you puncture a league of nations full of holes they have not the slightest doubt that they can hire somebody who can frame up a good one for you.

This is the frightful compact, Mr. President, that we are asked to make—to surrender our destinies to the league, with the awful penalty of immediate war upon us by all the combined nations composing its membership, should we decline in any respect to obey the decrees of the league, however destructive they may be of our happiness or prosperity.

This is the substitute we are asked to make for the peaceful and happy state under which we have lived during the greater part of our national career in peace and amity with the world. We have had but few wars, and have avoided war by avoiding the cause of war. We are now asked to avoid war by multi-

plying immeasurably the cause of war, and by surrendering to a heterogeneous league of diverse races our sovereign rights and privileges. By such a course the independence which was preserved by the patriotism of our people and the heroism of our soldiers in the fighting which has just been concluded will be surrendered, and the guaranties of peace which victory has afforded us will be mortgaged to every nation in the world.

If this constitution is ratified without being submitted to the American people in a political campaign, where it shall have been made an issue, and upon which they will have had an opportunity to render judgment in an election, then self-government in America will have disappeared. We are facing an abyss and the American people should not be led into it blindfolded. [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries will desist from any demonstrations.

#### DEMORILIZATION OF TROOPS.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to read a letter to the Senate as the basis of a few remarks I desire to make; and I read this letter because it is typical of hundreds of letters that I am receiving and that I assume other Senators are receiving. It is dated from a small town in my State:

DEAR MR. REED: Just a few minutes of your time. I know you have many such requests as I am going to ask of you, but this is my first one. It is this:

I have a boy who offered his services to the Government in August, 1918, and I was glad of it; but listen: The war is over. We have always employed or worked four or five hands. Two of the boys are in the Army; the others have quit and gone to farming; but none we get are experienced hands like my boy and the one that was drafted and is not out yet. This is the strange part of it: They are not working at all, or practically so.

Listen here: I got a letter from my boy to-day saying he was not working two hours a day—just lying around waiting for some one to die, as his job is in the laboratory in the autopsy of the dead. Here I am, working 12 or 14 hours a day, and my partner is doing the same. Do you think this is a fair proposition? I have done three men's work for the last two years, and they will not let my boy out now to help me do my work on the farm. Now I am needing my boy to help me the very worst kind. Here in the spring, when we need help so bad, the farmers need this and that thing done, such as we were called on the other day. We have pumps to repair, cars to load, fertilizers to unload, cream separators to deliver, and no help; and my boy is lying down there at Camp Jackson and has not done 15 minutes' work in three days. It puts me out with the Government, or with the Army officers, or wherever the blame lies.

Then he makes a request that this matter be investigated; and his son is at Camp Jackson. That is a letter from an old farmer, not always grammatical but full of good sense. I have another letter, that I am not going to read, which is from a private in the Air Service, who states that he has been making every effort to get released, and that he is there under great disadvantage, great loss, and he can not get released.

Mr. President, this war has been over now for a good while. Peace ought to have been made before this; and if we had been making peace instead of making contracts for the future, if we had been settling our own disputes instead of undertaking to provide for the settlement of all disputes that may hereafter arise, I think we would have been much nearer a final settlement of the peace conditions. But waiving that, it is certainly true that the keeping of the American boys in these camps in America is absolutely inexcusable.

I said the other day, and I repeat, that I believe the economic loss in labor plus the expense of the support in camp of each one of these men is not less than \$100 a month, and a million men in camp would mean a hundred million dollars a month. We are being asked to tax our people to the very limit, and we are taxing them to that limit. We are cutting down the resources of the country and the power of production by keeping as consumers something like three-quarters of a million men, instead of turning loose that number of men and making producers of them. It is a piece of stupidity without parallel, and, I say, unqualifiedly, without excuse, and the sooner it is remedied the better for our country.

How do you suppose a farmer feels who said to his boy 12 or 15 months ago, "God bless you, my son; go and give your time, and, if need be, give your life, for your country, and I and your mother will try to struggle along and take care of this farm and keep it going," when he knows that his boy has been kept in camp 12 or 14 months; that he not only has not seen Europe but that it is now certain that he never will be sent to Europe, and it has been certain for months that he will not be sent to Europe—how do you think that farmer feels when he sees his fields going to waste and his business going to destruction while his son is confined in a camp, doing nothing but responding once in a while to roll call or turning out on dress parade?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. REED. I do.



Mr. VARDAMAN. I have had in the last 60 days more than a thousand letters telling the same story related in the letter just read by the Senator. When he pictures the home of the old farmer whose boy has been carried away it recalls a letter that I received yesterday from a young wife on a farm. There is a scarcity of labor in Mississippi. This young woman's husband was unable to get labor to work his little farm last year. The season is passing very rapidly. They must begin to prepare for the crop there during the present month if they are to make a crop during this year. The boy is in one of the camps in the United States. He is not needed, but I am told by the department that they can not let him out just now.

I am glad the Senator has called attention to the matter, and I wish it were possible to do something to urge the War Department to perform its duty in regard to turning the men out, as well as paying them what the Government owes them.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am getting tired, as far as I am concerned, of wasting time with the War Department. I know something of what is the matter, because I happen to have heard a conversation almost immediately after the war closed when members of the War Department were asked what was going to be done to stop the mobilization of troops who were then on the way to camps, and what was going to be done to release the soldiers who were in the camps; and at that time the statement was made, in substance, that great care would be taken lest the labor market should be overcongested by the return of these troops, and an elaborate scheme had been worked out to release first those of particular occupations, and then those of other particular occupations. Then the reason for these releases appeared a few days later when a certain distinguished labor leader protested that already the country was being overrun with a surplussage of labor.

I do not think it is difficult at all to tell who is telling the War Department how and when to release the soldiers from the Army. I think it is time that Congress took some effective action to compel the demobilization of troops in this country. I think any department that will keep nearly three-quarters of a million men lying in camp, at great expense to the Government, at great inconvenience to themselves, and at great loss to the country, after war has been over as long as this war, is incompetent or worse than incompetent. It is time to end this business. It is time to speak with indignation, because the people of this country are feeling an indignation.

The idea of somebody sitting down here at the War Department, whether he is a Secretary of War or whatever he may be, and saying that he proposes to release these American citizens in such a manner and in such form that the labor market will not be congested! As though you could benefit the labor market by compelling the labor of the country to support hundreds of thousands of idle men, for in the last analysis the burden for the support of all must come from those who produce!

I suggested at the time of the conversation I referred to if the War Department could just get it into its little head that the American people had some sense and knew something about managing their own affairs we would get along better. I suggested that it is an absolute truth, although, of course, very much doubted in these days, that the citizen who holds no office at all has as much brains in his head as the individual who happens to fill a public position; that the boy who knew enough to run a great business, as many of them did, and entered the Army as a private because he was a patriot, might actually have as much sense about his own business affairs as some lieutenant of the Regular Army who never had earned a dollar in his life, who started into West Point at 17 years of age and has been on the Government pay roll ever since, and who never had any experience in life. If they would simply say to these boys, who are American citizens and who represent the average of American intelligence and American energy and American thrift and American brains, "You can go," they would not need to watch where they went or how they went. It would be found that they actually had sense enough to go back to their homes and to their fathers and their mothers and their wives and their sisters and their sweethearts and their jobs, and that they did not need the tutelage, they did not need the guardianship, of a Secretary of War or a Chief of Staff or a Lieut. Blank, whatever his name may be.

Mr. President, I have got very great respect for these gentlemen personally, but there is a theory abroad to-day that the people of the United States do not know anything, that all the wisdom in the land has been concentrated here in Washington, that the most of that has been concentrated in a few departments; and yet in the majority of cases the men in those departments could not hold a first-class job in a responsible business concern in the country.

I am simply trying to appeal for the doctrine of letting the American people have a chance to attend to their own affairs. I

am appealing for the doctrine that American boys should be allowed to return from these American camps.

Now, I propose to make an appeal for another class of men. There are across the seas nearly 2,000,000 American boys. The war is over. It is finally over. If it is not finally over, then Foch and Haig and Pershing and all the statesmen of Europe are madmen or worse than madmen—they are idiots—for they have had Germany by the throat since the 11th day of November; they have had her at their mercy; they have had their bayonets pressed against the breast of Germany, and in a position at any moment to destroy her; and if at this time they have left her in a position so that the armies of France and of England and of Belgium and of Italy can not take care of that situation, then they have been acting, I say, like madmen; and I am sure they have not so acted.

If this is true, why should our troops be kept there longer? If you tell me it is the lack of transportation, I ask this question: If we could send 300,000 men each month to Europe through seas that were infested with submarines and that were sown with mines, through seas that were so dangerous that every vessel had to be convoyed and had to run upon a zigzag course, why can we not, when the seas are open and clear from all danger, return them as rapidly as we sent them?

I have a letter in my possession from a colonel, a colonel who went into this war from the ranks of civil life, who, knowing or anticipating the war before most men did, prepared himself for it, educated himself for it, qualified himself in the highest degree—a man who never flinched from any difficulty, and who never shirked any danger, who never protested against any hardship as long as the war lasted. I received a letter from him a few days ago in which he said: "So far as I am concerned, so far as the officers are concerned, of course we are quartered in a way that is reasonably satisfactory; but you will be surprised," said this colonel, "when I say to you that, probably, our common soldiers are suffering as many hardships or greater than they were during the war, because," he said, "our transportation, which we had largely borrowed from France and England, has been withdrawn from us, and we are actually finding it difficult to get our supplies; and our men are staying here during the winter months, when the ground is sodden and the air damp, when the rain is pouring down in torrents day after day, when sickness is rife, and when these men are enduring the greatest kind of hardships;" and, he added, "if anyone believes that these troops want to be kept here a single minute for any other purpose than to force a just and honorable peace that individual is mistaken."

Mr. President, I have appeals sent to me every day, as do other Senators, that would melt a heart of stone—the appeal of mothers for their sons, of mothers whose hearts ache, whose eyes are blinded with tears for the want of a sight of the gallant fellows they gave birth to and whom they sent abroad in the service of their country. They want them back home, and they ought to be brought back home. I have appeals from fathers who say that their business is going to ruin—the business in which their son was one of the chief pillars and stays. They want their sons back to help save their business. I have appeals from widows for their sons to be sent back in order that they may preserve the estate that needs their care.

You can go to the War Department from now until you are black in the face, and you will get the curt answer of some military gentleman that they have a general order that can not be varied from. A general order may be necessary, but I protest that the keeping of this American Army abroad another day is a wrong upon that Army; that it is a wrong upon this country; that they should be returned at once; and the 60 or 90 days that have been frittered away are 60 or 90 tragic days filled with heartaches, filled with loss of time, and filled with a loss of money.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I have very great sympathy with the views expressed by the Senator from Missouri with respect to the men who are in this country. I do not know any reason why we should have half a million or three-quarters of a million in camp in this country long after the war. As far as the men abroad are concerned, can the Senator advise us whether the tonnage at the command of the Government will enable us to bring the boys back from abroad more quickly than they are being brought?

Mr. REED. I can not advise the Senator whether the tonnage at the command of the Government will bring them back, but I can say that a Government that could get plenty of tonnage to carry men to Europe ought to be able to get tonnage to bring them back, and that if I were dealing with Great Britain, that has at its command so much tonnage, after Great Britain was asking and receiving of us all she receives from us, I would have the boats.



Mr. WALSH. The Senator will recall that we were something over a year in sending the Army across, taking them to Europe, with all this tonnage at our command.

Mr. REED. I will answer the Senator. The Senator was not in when I began my remarks. I said we had taken them over at the rate of 250,000 to 300,000 a month, and we ought to be able to bring them back at as rapid a rate.

Mr. WALSH. That would take some eight months, would it not?

Mr. REED. Yes; but we are not bringing them back at that rate, and we are not approximating that rate. As nearly as I can make out from the statements in the newspapers, instead of bringing them home on passenger ships we are trying to transform or transmute some freighters into ships to bring them back. We were told—I saw it in the papers the other day, and I assume that it is correct—that in an interview the Secretary of War said it took 49 days to change one of these freighters into a passenger vessel.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is a member of the Military Affairs Committee and I am not, but I got the impression from what I learned about the matter that much of the deplorable condition that undoubtedly exists at the debarkation port of Brest is due to the fact that the returning armies are congregated there in such a number that they are unable to get ships with which to take them out.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think it is true, although I did not get it as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. I got it in the newspapers through an interview with Senator OWEN that they have a very large number of men at Brest, which is said to be a very bad place to keep men, and they have not ships with which to move them. But the fact that they brought the men to Brest not having the ships to move them does not excuse the failure to have the ships.

It is the business to have these ships, and I repeat if we could get them over at the rate of 300,000 a month through seas that were infested with submarines and sown with mines we ought to be able to get them back through seas that are open and not in danger. They are engaged, according to this newspaper statement, and I think it is correct, in transforming a lot of old freight ships into passenger ships, and the statement purporting to come, as I said a moment ago, from the Secretary of War was that it took 49 days to change one of these ships; and when you have it changed I will venture the assertion that you will not have a very good ship to haul human beings in.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. But why is it that we do not get the ships and bring the boys back that we had to take them over? Why do we not demand them? Why do we not get them back as a right? We have certainly done enough for France and England in this war, and we are certainly doing enough now when we are controlling the price of American foodstuffs and American products for their benefit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the able Senator from Missouri said that in a letter which he had received from some commanding colonel there was a statement that the transports were being taken from us. May I ask the Senator if he understood from that—

Mr. REED. The Senator misunderstood me. Transportation in France—the motor transports, the cars, and things that haul goods over there in France.

Mr. LEWIS. Oh, the letter refers to the interior transportation in France, not transports?

Mr. REED. Yes; transportation in France was the term I used.

Mr. LEWIS. I was interested to know what that did refer to; but I nevertheless ask the Senator if he does not recognize that many of the ships which we were permitted to use for taking the men over while we were at war were ships of the countries which are generally spoken of as our allies, and now that those countries are at peace they have taken those ships for their own uses, and they are wholly out of our command, and we are powerless to control them, and if that is not one of the exceeding difficulties we are now contending with?

Mr. REED. I can not tell you just what our difficulties are, because it has been the policy of the State Department to keep as profoundly secret as possible from Congress many important facts that Congress ought to have known. So I can not tell you exactly what the situation is.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. But I make this remark, if the Senator will let me finish the sentence. I have already made it. When we

count the obligations that France and England are under to the United States and the obligations they are daily being placed under by the furnishing to them of foodstuffs and of raw material and the control of prices for their benefit, but at the expense of the American producer, I know they would furnish these ships if the proper kind of demand was made, and it ought to be made mighty quickly.

Mr. LEWIS. May I ask my friend what method would the Senator from Missouri suggest to enforce France and Britain to put their ships at our command? I should like to have it myself.

Mr. REED. If the Senator wants to know, I will tell him what I would tell them if I was running this business. Instead of writing leagues of nations, with perpetual peace in them, instead of spending my time talking about some scheme that is to concern the civilization of the future, I would say to the gentlemen running those countries: "I need some ships. I need them now. I want you to give them to us. I believe you will give them to us." And if they did not give them to us I would see to it that every benefit and advantage they have in the American market was taken away the day after to-morrow. [Applause in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The occupants of the galleries are totally disregarding the rule of the Senate. The Chair did not make the rule; the Chair does not approve of it; but it is the rule of the Senate that no marks of approval or disapproval can come from the occupants of the galleries; and it will be the very painful duty of the Chair to clear the galleries if this demonstration occurs again.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that this difficulty was foreseen by a number of Senators before ever we began to transport our Army to France. When the first appropriation bill was passing through this body with the increased appropriation for our Army, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] was, I believe, the first one who brought this subject to the attention of the Senate. He insisted at that time that there should be a distinct provision put upon the appropriation bill that would require England to furnish just as many ships to return our soldiers as she furnished to take them over. If that had been done, this difficulty never would have arisen at this time.

I wish to say to the Senator I am told there are three English ships put at our disposal for the transportation of all the troops we have on the other side to this side. I do not know whether that number is correct or not, but I have seen it stated in the press, and I have also had an official of the War Department make the same statement to me.

Mr. LEWIS. If the Senator from Missouri will allow me one suggestion, though he ought not to be interrupted, I am only anxious that the War Department shall have no further blame upon it than it should bear, and that wherever it is not responsible for any particular condition that fact should be made known and plain to the American people. May I ask my able friend from Missouri if he contemplates this thought, that while it would be an act of goodness and justness for Britain to give us any shipping she has, must we not consider that she is using many of her own ships to take her own soldiers back to their homes in Australia, in Canada, and other portions of the globe, and that that probably consumes much of her ships which heretofore she had at our service to bring soldiers over to France?

Mr. REED. Does the Senator state that as a fact?

Mr. LEWIS. I am merely stating from newspaper report. [Applause in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not going to sit here all the afternoon admonishing the occupants of the galleries to obey the rule of the Senate. If this occurs again the galleries will be cleared.

Mr. LEWIS. I am compelled to reply to the able Senator that I read that in the public report, as that is the only way, of course, we can get any news touching what Britain does. If it be true, we have to consider it; if it be not true, then it will probably mean that Britain has some ships which if accessible it would not be inappropriate for this country to ask the use of. I was only calling this fact to the attention of the Senator that he might consider it in connection with his presentation of a very worthy subject.

Mr. REED. I did not mean when I asked the Senator if he stated that as a fact to tell us the source of his information, but I wanted to know whether the Senator understood it to be a fact, because of the manner in which he put the question to me; it was rather hypothetical and I did not know how to reply to it.

Now, my understanding is that Great Britain is using her ships and that she is using some of them to transport her sol-



diers back home, and she is using a great many of them in commerce; that Great Britain, unlike the United States, has been very forward looking and has been prepared to invade all countries with her commerce the moment her vessels were released.

Mr. President, I have also been informed by the vice chairman of the Military Affairs Committee recently that Mr. Baker said that by April we would be bringing over our troops at the rate of 300,000 a month. I hope that prophecy will turn out better than some others we have had, but if we are going to bring our troops back from Europe at the rate of 300,000 a month in April I want to know why we are not discharging them in the month of February in the American camps and getting them out, and getting all of them out. The greater the difficulty in getting soldiers back from Europe, the more that is delayed, the more reason there is for emptying the American camps and stopping this enormous drain upon our Treasury.

Mr. President, there is a limit to the resources even of America. This wonderful land, with a wealth so much greater than we imagine, has nevertheless mortgaged her future to an extent that no other nation prior to this war has ever mortgaged its future. We have dealt in billions as in former times the world dealt in millions. The apparent prosperity of the hour is that kind of prosperity which a man enjoys who has mortgaged his home for \$10,000, and therefore has \$10,000 in the bank as ready cash, but who nevertheless is in debt \$10,000. The illustration is not happy. It would have been better if I had said the man had mortgaged his home for \$10,000 and had spent \$9,000 of it and had \$1,000 still in bank. Sooner or later the pinch hour is bound to come, and that peace will be greater or less just as we act wisely from this time on.

The first thing manifestly to do is to stop the waste to some extent. All war is waste. Every boy taken from the farm means not only the loss of that man's time but it means more than waste, it means perhaps the farm half cultivated. That means higher prices in the market when you come to aggregate it altogether. It means that this man taken from his home lives at an expense two or three times greater than he would have lived under in his own home. It means the disarrangement of all business. It is but common sense to get these men out, to get them back, to let them cease being consumers, and let them become producers, and instead of being a public burden let them become a public benefaction.

Get the Army back as soon as we can get it back; stop the expense. Then will be the time to begin to hope, through the productive capacities of this vast Army of splendid young men, to rehabilitate our fortunes and to stop that strain and draft and drain upon our resources, which, if they be not stopped, will ultimately produce very hard times in this country.

Mr. President, the man who keeps a million men in the field one day longer than necessary deprives this country of at least \$2,000,000 a day, in my opinion, indeed, I think a much larger sum. We are going to be asked to buy bonds in an enormous quantity, but the people of this country are going to be in no temper to buy bonds unless they find the Government is willing to cut down its expenses.

In that connection I desire to say the war is over. When the war began, we started in erecting acres and hundreds of acres of buildings in Washington, and we began importing clerks from all parts of the United States and putting them into those buildings. I think we must make allowance for waste; we must make allowance for miscalculation; we must be very charitable in our criticism; and yet, as I went through those buildings day after day, I was impressed with the fact that the lives and the limbs of those clerks were actually being jeopardized because they were crowded in so thickly that they were falling over each other. It was my hope that when the war was over that thing would cease, and that these clerks would be returned to their homes, at least a very large percentage of them; but you can go down through those buildings to-day and you will find that the number of clerks has been but slightly decreased.

Mr. SMOOT. In some of those buildings the number of clerks has been increased.

Mr. REED. I am informed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] that in some of the departments the number of clerks has actually been increased. You can not get the head of a department to cut down his clerical help. There is first one excuse and then another given for not doing it. I am about prepared to say on these matters that the only way to retrench is to retrench, as somebody once said the way to resume was to resume.

Why, Mr. President, this Senate, discovering that these temporary buildings out here in front of the Capitol would require over a million dollars of expenditure in order to make them usable, and believing that there would be a reduction in clerks,

passed a bill to discontinue the work upon those buildings. That bill went to the House of Representatives, but it was followed there by the representatives of these departments, and they succeeded in persuading the committee in the House of Representatives not to report the bill, or at least to take no action upon it. So the million or the million and a half of money is to be expended on these buildings after the war is over to house an army of clerks after the army ought to have been demobilized and returned to their homes. I do not say that to criticize the House of Representatives; I have never indulged in any criticism of that great coordinate branch of our Government; but I say, it to criticize the department chiefs, who went down to the House of Representatives and persuaded them that they had to keep this army of employees.

Mr. President, that you can heap the burden upon the people for a while—for our folk have been good-natured and have paid their money out like thoroughbreds during the war, mortgaging their incomes, mortgaging their future, and doing it gladly—is no certain reason to believe that they are going forever and a day to continue to pay these taxes, when they have a right to believe the money is being wasted.

I had intended to say a word, and I have said a good many words. It is time somebody said something about getting these armies home; it is time that they found some means down at the department whereby a second lieutenant can not keep a man lying there almost rotting in camp, who is worth four or five thousand dollars a year at home, or if he is not worth four or five thousand dollars is worth four or five dollars a day at home. In the circumlocution of camps affidavits that you have dependents upon you, solemn proof that some great calamity will befall—all these things are required before a man can get discharged who ought to have been discharged within 10 days after the war was over; who ought to have been sent home, and gladly, sent home, and probably paid a month's wages to start him out with. If you had given these boys 30 days' or 90 days' or even six months' pay, as they did in Canada, and let them have gone home you would still have been money ahead, for you would have saved their keep.

It is mismanagement; I unhesitatingly say it is the grossest mismanagement. I unhesitatingly say the time where patience has ceased to be a virtue has arrived, and for one I protest against this mismanagement. I do not know whether it will do any good to protest; I do not know that it would do any good for this Senate to pass a resolution; but unless the situation is remedied very soon I am going to offer a resolution regarding it.

I want at this time to give notice that on Saturday, after the reading of the Farewell Address of Washington, which, I presume, will still be read in pursuance of the ancient resolution of the Senate, I shall address the Senate, with its kind permission, upon the league of nations.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I desire to ask what bill is now pending before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill is now before the Senate.

#### MARKET PRICE OF LIBERTY BONDS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I coincide very largely, if not entirely, with the views of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I am receiving letters every day from parents asking that their sons may be sent home; and I am receiving letters from soldiers in the camps here and in the camps abroad, asking to be sent home. Many of these soldiers state that they have positions awaiting them, but that those positions can not be held up indefinitely. Yet there does not seem to be any way that we can get them home.

There is another matter that I want to speak about, and which I think is not entirely out of place in connection with what has just been said by the Senator from Missouri. I had hoped the chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. SIMMONS] would be here, but he has been called out of the Chamber. I see the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is here, and he is also a member of the Finance Committee. I want to ask him or any other member of the committee a question after I have read a letter, which I hold in my hand.

I have noticed in the newspapers of my State advertisements of firms or banks that they will purchase liberty bonds, inviting the holders of such bonds to come and deal with them. I received a letter from a friend of mine in Seattle, calling especial attention to these advertisements, and particularly calling attention to the fact that many of the national banks are encouraging people who hold liberty bonds to come in and sell them; also calling attention to the fact that the liberty bonds are being discounted from 5 to 7 per cent, and that the people who were urged a few months ago to buy liberty bonds and who did so at a very great sacrifice, acting under the patriotic appeals that



were made to them by these same bankers, were being compelled, in order to get food and to sustain themselves, to sell their bonds at a discount to the very same bankers who had appealed to their patriotic instincts to purchase the bonds some time ago.

I took the matter up with the Treasury Department to see whether or not the Treasury was doing anything or taking any steps to try to maintain these bonds at par, and apparently but very little has been done. I wrote this friend of the situation, and I have his letter in my hand, which I desire to read. I see the chairman of the Committee on Finance is now present, and I want to call his attention to this letter with reference to liberty bonds, and then to ask him a question. This gentleman says:

Beyond question the Congress of the United States can maintain its bonds at par. Is it right that this should be done? If so, why not do it? Should the great mass of our interest-bearing debts be permitted to get in the hands of a few, and at a "shave" at that? Already lines of men and women here in Seattle stand at the national bank counters—and no doubt do so elsewhere—waiting their turn for the "shave," notwithstanding the advice of these "patriots" not to dispose of them for less than par. People have to pay taxes, and ought to; they also have to purchase food. To do this it is calculated to set them to thinking when compelled to sell a United States bond to a national bank for less than 94 cents over the same counter which they paid 100 cents per dollar only a few months ago.

I will admit that we may not know just how to protest, which makes it all the worse for those who stand for law and order in all things.

Now, Mr. President, what I want to ask the chairman of the Committee on Finance, or any other member of that committee, is this: Is anything being done or is any proposition being considered for the maintenance of the liberty bonds of this country at par, especially the liberty bonds to a certain amount anyway, that are in the hands of people who by force of circumstances are compelled to dispose of those bonds in order to get a living, in order to maintain themselves? It does seem to me that something ought to be done in behalf of the clerks who, for instance, were practically forced by a departmental head to skip and save out of their monthly earnings a few dollars with which to buy a \$50 bond or a \$100 bond, who now, when the necessities of life force them, in order to raise some money, to sell these bonds, and they must sell them at a discount of from 5 to 7 per cent.

It probably would not be proper or advisable to make these bonds good in the hands of the men who hold them by the thousands or hundreds of thousands of dollars worth, but it does seem to me that something ought to be done, at any rate, so that the man and woman of limited means who may hold \$50 or \$100 or even \$1,000 worth of these bonds should have them maintained at par.

I do not pretend to know very much about how these things can be done, but it does seem to me that if a fund could be provided at the Treasury, out of which bonds up to \$100 or \$1,000 would be redeemed at par upon a proper showing to protect the Government, it ought to be done. I should therefore like to know of the chairman of the committee whether there is any proposition being considered or whether anything has been done under which this can be accomplished?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, of course the Senator understands that one of the most difficult questions that can confront any nation is that of always keeping its government obligations at par. There has not been a time since we began to issue liberty bonds—and especially is this true of the latter issues; in fact, it is absolutely true as to all of the issues except the first—when they have commanded par in the markets of this country.

Mr. LODGE. Except the three-and-a-halves.

Mr. SIMMONS. I said except the three-and-a-halves—and they are now below par. The Government, through the Secretary of the Treasury, has of course been very much concerned about this situation and has discussed with the Finance Committee possible ways and means of removing this condition. There is a provision, as I now recall, for a sinking fund, which sinking fund is not adequate, I think, and should be increased; but it was thought at the time that if a sinking fund were provided, it would help very materially to keep these bonds at a higher level. I do not think anybody thought that it would be possible for some little time, even with a large sinking fund, to bring them immediately to par.

One of the troubles about keeping these bonds at par grows out of the fact that a great many people have bought them through loans and upon the installment plan. They did not themselves have the money to invest, so they went to banks and borrowed it; the banks extended them credit and gave them time in which to pay, so as to permit them to make payments as they were able. In many instances these purchasers have found themselves unable to meet their payments, and consequently unable to hold their bonds. In other instances

persons who have bought these bonds have found that they needed the cash which they had invested in the bonds. This situation has forced them to throw great quantities of these bonds upon the market. That is one reason that has caused a decline in the liberty bonds.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am not asking for the reasons for or causes of the decline.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am giving the reasons, so that I may finally inform the Senator as to a statute which is now under contemplation by the Treasury Department and by the committees of the two Houses.

There is another scheme, which has become a sort of a system in this country on the part of designing speculators, which has had a great effect in pressing down the price of these bonds in the market. It is a scheme whereby issues of stock—wildcat stock, we sometimes call it; stocks of different kinds—are taken by agents and peddled all over the country. Wherever they can find a credulous person in possession of some of the liberty bonds he is offered these "high-interest bearing," "high-profit earning" stocks, according to the stories of the agents, for these low-interest bearing bonds; and they succeed in gathering up, so the Secretary of the Treasury advised the committee, enormous quantities of these bonds, which are immediately thrown upon the market and converted into cash at any price that can be obtained for them. That has had a very great tendency toward depressing the price.

To meet that situation, the Secretary of the Treasury has sent to the Finance Committee and to the Ways and Means Committee of the House a bill which he has prepared, which possibly may meet and overcome the evil; but that is a question yet to be determined. That bill is under consideration. I am very much inclined to think, if that bill passes, it will stop that method of exploiting the holders of these bonds and the throwing the bonds in such vast volumes upon the market.

Outside of a sinking-fund method and outside of another method which has probably helped to some extent to keep these bonds from going even to a lower level than they have now reached is the practice of the War Finance Corporation of each month setting apart a fund for the purpose of purchasing these bonds in the open market. I do not know how much that fund is, but I am advised that in recent months this institution has put in the hands of its agents in New York, and probably in Chicago and at other points, many millions of dollars.

Mr. LODGE. I think they have set aside for this purpose something over \$200,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was going to say that, in the aggregate, up to this time I think that corporation has invested something over \$200,000,000 in the purchase of liberty bonds for the sole and only purpose of trying to keep them from falling to a lower level or in the effort to raise them to a higher level. Those are methods that ordinarily would accomplish a greater result than seems to have been accomplished in this case.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator—he may have stated what I am about to suggest, but if so I missed it—surely we put in one of the bills passed by Congress a provision for a special fund to be used by the Secretary of the Treasury, in the nature of a revolving fund, to purchase bonds with a view of sustaining their price.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thank the Senator; we did that. So that the Secretary of the Treasury, I will say to the Senator from Washington, and the committees of the two Houses in charge of this matter have been alert and have, within their limitations, been doing what seemed to them to be expedient and necessary to help against the situation to which the Senator from Washington calls attention, and which, I think, is a very grave situation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Can the Senator tell me how the revolving fund to which he has referred is used? Is it used to buy bonds promiscuously or can an individual take his bond to the Treasury and get it redeemed at par?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I think it is used largely in the markets where bonds are bought and sold for the purpose of maintaining a standard price.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Has the committee considered any proposition that would make it possible for the holder of a hundred dollar bond to go to the Treasury Department and, upon a showing of his original ownership and of his necessities, have that bond redeemed at par?

Mr. SIMMONS. No, Mr. President; and I think, if the Senator will reflect, he will reach the conclusion that it is impossible for the Government to guarantee the par value of these bonds, unless the Government is ready and able to redeem all of them, if it becomes necessary.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Well, does not the Senator think that a plan like that could be worked out?



Mr. SIMMONS. I think, Mr. President, that if the Government were able to redeem all of its bonds there would be no necessity of issuing any more bonds.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I was not suggesting and did not put a proposition that to my mind would involve the redemption of all these bonds, but there are people who own a \$5,000 bond, a \$10,000 bond, a \$20,000 bond, or a million dollars in bonds. About those people I am not worrying, although I should like to see all of our bonds at par. I am not worrying particularly about bonds of the larger denominations to which I have referred, in the hands of people who are able to hold those bonds; but it seems to me, as I said a while ago—and I confess that I do not know very much about these financial matters—that we could provide a fund, and hedge it about with such restrictions as would prevent the Government being flooded with these bonds, under which the holder of a \$100 bond or a \$500 bond, on a proper showing and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury might prescribe, so as to prevent the bonds being poured in, could present them to the Treasury and have them redeemed at par. It may be difficult to work out such a plan, but it seems to me something of that kind could be provided, and I wanted to ask whether the committee had considered anything of that sort?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I will say to the Senator that no such proposition has been presented to the committee or discussed by the committee. That would be a very difficult proposition to work out. Of course, we could not very well say that the Government will redeem certain bonds of certain denominations and will not redeem bonds of other denominations. If it were desirable to provide that the Government should set apart a fund to be used in the purchase of the bonds of such holders as might be in distress and might by force of circumstances be compelled to put them upon the market, that could be done.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is what I have in mind, something of that kind.

Mr. SIMMONS. That could be done, but I do not know whether or not that would be a wise thing to do.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, it seems to me that something of the sort ought to be considered. It is a very important matter. The difficulty of it should not dishearten us if it is possible to work it out. The Senator has suggested in two sentences what I have really been trying to get at. The class that the Senator describes is the class I wish to take care of, namely, those who have a \$100 bond and have to dispose of it in order to get some money on which to live—people who are in distress. The plans and methods the Senator has described have not taken care of the situation; they have not prevented these bonds from going way below par, and something ought to be done to meet this particular situation.

Mr. President, the man who has a \$5,000 bond knows that the bond is going to be redeemed some day, and that when it matures it is going to be paid in full by this Government; everybody knows that; but what I should like to see done is to provide a fund of some sort to take care of the bonds that will be taken care of when they mature, of course; but which should be taken care of now, in order to meet the distressing conditions that confront some of our people. I wish that some effort would be made to create a fund in the Treasury Department that could be used in that very way.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I merely desired to make a suggestion with regard to this subject.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Very well; I am through.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, we are struggling against an unfortunate situation. The bonds were sold at an artificial price. The exemptions and the rates attached to them were not sufficient to make them sell at par in the market when they were placed. We relied on the patriotism of the country to buy those bonds for more than they were worth. The result is, of course, that, as they were not sold to meet the market when they were issued, they have never been able to meet it since, because they were sold above their real value.

The 3½ per cent bond was made a desirable bond, and it remained above par until very recently certainly, although carrying the lowest rate of interest of any of the liberty bond issues; but it was given an exemption, which held it up. The other bonds never were worth what they were sold for when the loans were placed; that is the trouble. The difficulty of meeting such distressing cases, as the Senator has described, has given me, for one, a great deal of thought; but it is very hard to see how we can remedy the situation, because, if we begin to redeem

the \$100 bonds, we shall find a great increase in the number of hundred-dollar bonds to be redeemed at par. We have made some provision on this subject, which the Senator from North Carolina has pointed out, but it has been only palliative; and now everywhere in my city the newspapers are full of advertisements of readiness to purchase these bonds, to be bought by people who can afford to hold them.

The fundamental trouble is in not having met the market when the bonds were issued. If that had been done, people would either have bought them below par, or they would have bought them at par when they were worth it. We have a very difficult situation, and I, for one, confess that it is very hard to see how it can be met.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if I were the Senator from Washington, in answering that letter I would advise the writer of it that up to the present time we have issued over \$16,000,000,000 worth of bonds, that there is staring the country in the face at the present time a further issue of thirteen to fourteen billion dollars' worth of bonds, and with that amount of bonds in circulation it will be absolutely impossible, as long as money is worth what it is to-day, to maintain those bonds at par.

If we should agree to redeem at par all \$100 bonds, every issue of bonds hereafter would be of \$100 bonds, and it would simply mean that in the case of every loan that was put up and sold it would be only a very few months until the Government would have to redeem in some way the whole amount of the loan.

The Senator could say further to the writer of the letter that at the rate of 4½ per cent a taxable bond, such as is provided for in the law now, will of necessity sell for less than par. Money to-day is worth from 6 to 7 per cent; and therefore a bond of this kind that is taxable will not bring in the market more than about 94 to 94½ cents on the dollar.

If we want to make a change in the value of the bonds already issued, the terms of the bonds must be changed; and I do not believe that will be done. The Senator from Massachusetts has well stated that these bonds when sold, at the rate of interest they were carrying, were not worth par by any manner of means; and I know thousands of people who subscribed for liberty bonds with the distinct understanding that they would sell the bonds, and they were perfectly willing to pocket the loss.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely.

Mr. SMOOT. Millions and hundreds of millions of dollars of bonds have been sold in that way, and bought for that very purpose.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely. They were perfectly willing to give that 5 or 6 per cent to the Government. That is the case with many people; but now the bond is meeting the market, as every other obligation is to-day.

Mr. SMOOT. And it will have to meet the market hereafter, with an additional amount of bonded indebtedness.

Mr. LODGE. Absolutely.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks the exemption from taxation of the Federal farm-loan bonds, and the attracting of money in that direction, has affected in any way the market value of these bonds?

Mr. SMOOT. Just as soon as the Federal Farm Loan Board offer a bond issue, inasmuch as the bonds are nontaxable, as the Senator knows, they are taken immediately. The Federal Farm Loan Board could issue bonds to-day, if we should authorize them to do so, to the extent of two billion, of three billion, or five billion dollars and sell them, without a doubt, in a very short time.

Mr. KENYON. What reason or justice is there in exempting those bonds from taxation and not exempting what we term liberty loan bonds?

Mr. SMOOT. I will answer the Senator very frankly. Because of the fact that Congress was appealing to the farmers of the country, and for that reason the bonds were exempted. I think that is the proper way to answer the question, and I think I ought to answer it just exactly in that way.

Mr. KENYON. It did not really help the farmers particularly, did it? It helped those who wanted to buy a tax-exempt bond.

Mr. SMOOT. It certainly will help the man who buys the bond. There is not any doubt about that.

Mr. KENYON. And it will keep on affecting the liberty bonds.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know that there is anything else I desire to say, unless the Senator wants to ask me a further question.



Mr. JONES of Washington. No; I wanted to say just a word myself.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will yield just a moment, I will add that one of the bills that we passed—I forget the date—provided a revolving fund of \$500,000,000. The Senator will remember that right after that bill was passed our 4½ per cent bonds advanced from about \$95 up to about \$98 on the hundred; but then the sales began in such large quantities that they soon drove down the price of the bonds. If the Government should undertake to buy all the bonds that were offered, it would bankrupt the Government immediately, just as the Senator from North Carolina has said; but we provided that revolving fund, thinking that perhaps a purchase of bonds at some critical time would tend to stabilize the price of the bonds. I do not know but that it has done so; but the \$500,000,000 is a mere bagatelle when you take into consideration the vast quantities of bonds that are passing daily in transactions of commerce in this country.

I will say that a great many of the advertisements come from stockbrokers. The stockbroking business to-day is unprofitable. There is very little transfer of stocks in any part of the United States. Thousands of stockbrokers are failing all over the United States, and those that are living are living from hand to mouth. If they can make one-sixteenth of 1 per cent upon transactions in liberty bonds, they are just that much ahead; and they are trying to maintain their business until better times come through the transfer and purchase of these liberty bonds.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I shall send this RECORD to my constituent. It probably will not bring him very much consolation.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, will not the Senator also send to his constituent the votes on the different appropriations that are going on in Congress? That ought to interest him, too, I am sure.

Mr. JONES of Washington. He will acquaint himself with the aggregate amount of our appropriations, anyhow. As I say, it will not give him very much consolation. We have had practically a confession here that it is impossible for the Government to take care of the situation that I have described, and that the writer of this letter has described to me. I do not like us to take a position of that kind.

The Senator from Utah says that if all the obligations of the Government were presented for redemption at once it would bankrupt the Government. I think I know enough about finance to agree with him in that statement; but that is not what is proposed to be done at all. It is suggested that a special fund be created to redeem bonds under particular conditions, and the proof of particular conditions. Now, I admit that that would be hard to work out. I admit that if the bonds were selling on the market at \$95, and if they knew that in case a certain showing were made to the Government they would be redeemed at par, an attempt would be made to get these bonds in the hands of people who could comply with those conditions; but, Mr. President, our people are not all perjurers. They are not all people who would try to defraud the Government or deceive the Government. I believe that if a fund were provided under which bonds to the amount of, say, \$500—I do not mean \$100 bonds—could be presented to the Treasury and redeemed at par upon proof that the person presenting the bonds was the original purchaser of the bonds—not an assignee but the original purchaser of the bonds—and that it was necessary for him to secure money to take care of distressing conditions, and that was the reason why the bonds are presented for redemption, there would not be a flood upon the Treasury under such circumstances, with stringent rules. I am merely suggesting an outline, of course.

Of course, it may be, upon mature consideration, that that could not be worked out; but it does seem to me that we ought to try to do something to work out this situation and take care of it. This revolving fund only benefits the man with money. He is the only one that gets any benefit from the revolving fund that we have had, except the reflex action upon the bonds. They go into the public bond market and buy bonds from brokers—from men who are able to carry the bonds. These men probably want to sell their bonds in order to get money to invest. I am not interested in those people. I am interested, of course, in our bonds and in our obligations; and I should like to see some fund or some way provided, or an attempt made to provide it, under which the men who bought these \$50 or \$100 bonds by skimping and saving and denying themselves can now, when stress comes upon them, go to the Government and get the face of the bonds, instead of having to go to some broker or banker and dispose of the bonds at a large discount.

I hope we will not stand here confessing that we can not do anything to meet that situation. I hope a serious attempt will

be made by the proper committees and by the Secretary of the Treasury to suggest some plan under which the situation can be met.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that I am very glad he brought up this matter. It is one that ought to receive very serious consideration; and I have no doubt the Senator's remarks this afternoon may lead to some reflection that may eventuate in some scheme that will be helpful.

I want to say to the Senator, however, that I do not recall and I do not think that there is, a single country among the belligerents whose war bonds are to-day selling for par. The same fate befell the war bonds of England and France and Italy and Germany that has befallen our war bonds. As the Senator from Massachusetts says, of course these bonds were issued under very extraordinary circumstances. They were taken by our people, however, in a spirit of patriotism, with full knowledge at the time they were taken—except in the case of the first issue—that bonds previously issued of the same character, with the same rate of interest, were selling below par. I do not know now exactly what was the price of our liberty bonds of the second and third issues at the time of our last liberty-bond sale—

Mr. SMOOT. Ninety-seven and something.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand that it was 97 and something, a little bit higher than they are now; but every purchaser of one of the last issue of liberty bonds bought them with full knowledge of the fact that they were not worth par in the open market; and so, if we are to have another issue of those bonds every purchaser will buy them with full knowledge that they are not worth par in the open market. As long as the spirit of patriotism in this country is sufficiently alive to make a flotation of these bonds possible under those conditions we will continue to sell our issues, but when that spirit disappears and these bonds have to be sold upon a commercial basis, of course you can not float them at 100 cents on the dollar with the knowledge that they will not, as soon as purchased, be worth that much money.

As the Senator from Massachusetts has very correctly said, there is but one complete remedy for that situation. What the Senator suggests would give some relief to a certain class of bondholders, and it may be that there is a certain class that is entitled to special consideration and for whom some relief provision ought to be adopted. But, Mr. President, the only way in which we can be assured that these bonds will maintain their value in the market at the price at which they are sold by the Government is either by the extension of the exemption from taxation now allowed by law, or by an increase in the interest rate. That, I think, is pretty generally understood in this country, and the question is, Are we ready to further exempt bonds from taxation, and are we ready to further increase the rate of interest?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, since the discussion of this afternoon I telephoned to the War Department to ascertain the number of soldiers in the United States at the time of the signing of the armistice and how many had been discharged. The statements made here in debate almost made it appear that the officers of the Army and the Secretary of War were willfully negligent in the work of demobilizing the Army. Why, it seems to me that anyone who knows Secretary Baker, and knows of his tremendous energy—that he works day and night—will agree that it does not seem fair or right that he and the officers under him should be condemned when they are doing the very best that can be done, and are making a record that is most commendable in effecting the discharge of the soldiers.

Mr. President, I inquired how many soldiers had been discharged from cantonments and Army posts in the United States, and was informed that there had been discharged up to to-day 1,156,000, and that the number in the United States on November 11, 1918, was 1,676,510. Thus, from two-thirds to three-fourths of the soldiers that were in the cantonments and fortifications and forts of the United States at the time of the surrender of the Germans have been discharged by the War Department.

I will ask any fair Senator whether that is not a remarkable record. You must remember that it takes time to discharge men. They have to be examined; a certain number that are in hospitals can not be released; it takes time to make the physical examinations of millions of men by a limited number of physicians; it takes time to prepare the data for the permanent record the Government must keep of each soldier.

I asked how many soldiers had been transported from France since the 11th day of November, 1918, and the answer was given that 232,000 had arrived in the United States, and that 60,000 are now at sea bound for American ports. The war came



to an end very suddenly. The United States was not prepared to transport its soldiers. We lacked the number of vessels that were necessary for that purpose. We have been unable to get either France or Great Britain to furnish ships for the purpose of transporting soldiers. Now, Mr. President, when we consider the fact that Great Britain has soldiers from Australia, England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, soldiers from Canada and India that must be returned, you can readily see that she is pretty well occupied with her own returning soldiers, and that consequently her ships are very largely used for that purpose.

Mr. President, we find also that these other nations are engaged in similar tasks, in service which they regard absolutely necessary and essential. When Senators say that the War Department is asleep when it has demobilized two-thirds or three-fourths of the Army in the United States and has demobilized the troops in France at as rapid a rate as it is possible to transport them to our shores, it seems to me that they are indulging in criticism that is unfair, and they are not giving credit to men who are trying to do their duty.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator tell me why we still have in the camps in the United States approximately three-quarters of a million men?

Mr. SHAFROTH. We have not that number.

Mr. REED. When was it reduced below that number?

Mr. SHAFROTH. The number that have been discharged up to to-day, according to a telephone message from Gen. March's office in the War Department, is 1,156,000 men.

Mr. REED. How many does that leave?

Mr. SHAFROTH. That leaves 560,000 men.

Mr. REED. What are those half million men doing in camp all this time?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, it takes time to discharge men. They are discharged after an examination. Many of them are sick and can not be discharged now.

Mr. REED. Oh, but, Mr. President, the Senator does not mean to say that these are sick men?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I do not say that all of them are. There are certain numbers on the sick list. Many of those who have passed the physical examination have been released.

Mr. REED. Yes; many of them have gone, but 500,000 of them are still here.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That is true; but, nevertheless, the proportion of those that are sick is larger among those who remain than among those who went. Now, as I said to the Senator, it takes time to demobilize men. It took a great many months to demobilize the men in the Civil War. The great parade of the soldiers of the Union in this city did not take place until months after the surrender of Lee at Appomattox. It requires a large number of men to remain at cantonments, forts, and camps to guard and keep them in good condition until complete demobilization has taken place and until Congress determines what we will do with our cantonments.

We have had criticism continually. The War Department has done nothing that was right, according to some. No matter what is done, it is wrong; and yet I make the statement that no nation on earth ever made the preparations for war that the United States did with greater dispatch nor transported to a foreign country the number of men that the United States landed in France in so short a time.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the work that was done. I want to show just what has been the record in transporting our soldiers to France. There was a great deal of discussion here in the past about the slowness of the War Department in transporting troops overseas. Morning after morning Senators would ask, Why do we not get the men over to France? Why do we not get them on the firing line?

I have a comparison between Great Britain's action and the action of the United States. Here are the figures: In the first period of the war, from the 14th day of August, 1914, until the 1st day of January, 1915, England sent to France only 480,000 men. From that time until the 1st day of January, 1916, England sent to France only a sufficient additional number of men to make a total of 1,000,000. There was nearly a year and a half that England, presumably much better prepared for war than we were, had spent in getting across the channel of a few miles into France only 1,000,000 soldiers. By the 1st of January, 1917, the total number of soldiers that Great Britain had transported to France was but 1,500,000, and by January 1, 1918, the total number she had landed there was 2,000,000 men.

Look at the record of the United States. I warrant that no one can say but that the record of the War Department in the preparation for war and in the transportation of soldiers to Europe has been far better than that of any other nation in the history of the world—far better than that of Great Britain.

The war started between the United States and Germany on the 6th day of April, 1917, and from that time until the 11th day of November, 1918, the United States transported and landed in France about 2,000,000 men. I can give you the exact number. The total number of men transported was 2,002,175. Not in four years, not in three years, but in one year and a half the United States Government had collected these soldiers, drilled them, provided transportation for them, and had landed them in France. Is there any record of any nation in the history of the world equals that in preparation for war?

When you remember that for the first year and a half Great Britain transported to France only 1,000,000 men, you can readily see that in our year and a half we have doubled the record of Great Britain, which had a passage of only 42 miles crossing the Channel in order to land her soldiers in France, while we had a distance to traverse of more than 3,000 miles.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; I will answer the question if I can.

Mr. REED. While England had landed only 1,000,000 men actually in France, how many million had she trained in her own country?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I suppose quite a number, but she never took all of them over.

Mr. REED. Oh, well, but as a matter of fact had not she trained a greater army than she had sent to France, and was she not simply holding that army in her own country for the finishing touches?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I do not think so. I think she was holding some, and she was, of course, training soldiers. But, Mr. President, so was the United States. The very fact that on the 11th of November, 1918, at the time of the signing of the armistice, we had in the United States in the cantonments and in the forts and other places 1,676,510 men shows that we were training men also and did not have time to transport them in that short period of time.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator, of course, is discussing an entirely different question than that which I discussed. I said nothing about demobilization of the Army. That is no answer to the fact that you are not getting men back home as soon as you should to say you got them over as quickly as you ought to. But I wish to call the Senator's attention—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I wish to remind the Senator that I have been answering criticisms which have been made, and which I say have been made principally upon the other side of the aisle, to the effect that there has been delay in nearly everything the War Department undertook; and it is a record that is much better than that of any department in any government that ever prepared armies for war.

Mr. REED. I wish that were true.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If you will allow me to put these figures in I will show it is true.

Mr. REED. I wish to ask the Senator a question about his figures. Of course, anybody can make up figures when he starts to get a result. I wish to know if it is not true that England, with her population—I am speaking about England, Ireland, and Scotland; Great Britain we will call that to contradistinguish it from the British Empire—had not raised, equipped, and trained and had ready there at the front, or ready for the front, only a few miles away, an army millions greater than the figures which the Senator has given?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will say to the Senator that she did have some men in England. There is no doubt about that; just as we had 1,600,000 men in the United States at the close of the war. There is no doubt in the wide world but that the speed and the expedition with which these men were put to the front by England was slow compared to that which the United States developed in transporting 3,000 miles every soldier that we landed in France.

I will state to the Senator, with respect to these figures, that they have been compiled by the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Crowell, and they show the exact number of men that were enlisted and the number of men that were transported. They show the manner in which the various departments furnishing supplies had complied with the speed orders that were urged.

Mr. REED. Does that show that we had enough shells on the front?



Mr. SHAFROTH. Of course, you can not declare war on the 6th day of April and expect to have manufactured and shipped all the necessary materials, especially when it was necessary in many cases to build factories for their manufacture, and expect to deliver them in time for a battle six months thereafter. That would be a physical impossibility.

Mr. REED. The Senator said these figures showed the system used in a way that led me to believe that we had performed something marvelous. I am not here criticizing and do not want to get him into that line of discussion, but I will say to the Senator that if he is undertaking to demonstrate to the country that we sent our men into battle fully prepared and equipped, he had better keep away from that question.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I think the records are accurate. They have been compiled very carefully.

Mr. REED. I will show you Gen. Pershing's telegram in a few moments.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I wish to show the Senate just what we did. The Army in Europe on the 11th day of November, 1918, amounted to 2,002,175. In the States we had 1,676,510; in the Insular possessions and in Alaska we had 55,735; a grand total in our Army, excluding marines, of 3,707,132; including the marines the grand total was 3,734,420.

Mr. President, England had perhaps between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 men. I do not believe that they had more than that, if they had that number. We raised ours in 18 months and sent 2,000,000 of them to France 3,000 miles away, while England took four years and three months to raise her army and had in France at the time of the surrender 2,000,000 men.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator, however, will admit that with all the men we sent to Europe England transported over 60 per cent of them?

Mr. SHAFROTH. England did transport a great many; there is no doubt about that. We did not have the vessels. But England was very anxious then to get them over. She was much more anxious at that time to get them over and save her forces there than she is now to get them back.

Mr. SMOOT. What the Senator states is absolutely true.

Mr. SHAFROTH. There is no doubt about that, and we can not get ships on that account.

Mr. SMOOT. But we could have done so if the resolution that was offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and upon which he delivered a speech in the Senate and which was finally referred to the Foreign Relations Committee and lies there now perfectly dead—

Mr. SHAFROTH. What is it?

Mr. SMOOT. A resolution that there should be an agreement between this country and England that she would grant to the United States the same shipping facilities after the war to get our men back into this country that she offered to get them over to France.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That shows great foresight on the part of the Senator from Iowa, and perhaps it ought to have been considered; but if it was not taken up it was the fault of Congress, it was not the fault of the Secretary of War.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know about that; I will not say that.

Mr. SHAFROTH. There might have been said, if we had passed that resolution, that we were delaying the sending of troops over there.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no.

Mr. SHAFROTH. One can criticize anything that is done, I care not what it is. Right now the contention was made in the early part of the discussion to the effect that President Wilson is delaying the soldiers coming back by negotiating for a league of nations to prevent future wars instead of only fixing the terms of peace in a treaty.

When Senators criticize that effort they are criticizing not only the President of the United States but they are criticizing every Government that is at the peace table. Is it possible that the President ought to have interposed an objection to try to establish a permanent peace when all the powers seemed willing and anxious to make provisions to prevent future wars? Senators must remember that when they criticize that fact they are criticizing every one of our allies, because every one of them wanted this league of nations determined upon before there was a treaty of peace outlined. Everybody knows that if we do not get a league of nations before we get the treaty signed, we never will be able to get Germany into any such league. We can force her now by reason of the fact that in the settlement of the peace terms we can make those terms absolute. When it is announced that the President of the United States urges a league of nations to prevent wars, critics say then that the cause of the delay in bringing our troops home is the President. Oh, yes, it is the President that is delaying demobilization, when, as a matter of fact, the

force that was most insistent upon a league of nations was the Government of Great Britain, even more so than the United States.

The Senator from Missouri has suggested that America is simply one nation and that we are to be in a league with eight foreign Governments, and that therefore these eight foreign nations might be against our one, our own Government. What could Great Britain say? The representatives of Great Britain could say, We have India; we have Canada; we have various other possessions with populations amounting to five times as much as that of the United States. We find ourselves in the condition of being one nation in a league with eight foreign nations; the eight might be against Great Britain.

If you are going to be controlled by an argument of that kind, you can never have a league of nations. It is impossible to have one, because each one will say, "We have to yield something and therefore we will not go in," and this war with all its horrors, with its tragic losses both in life and in property is liable to be precipitated again by a trivial incident such as the killing of an archduke. Can it be wrong for nations to agree that they will stand together in preventing war?

I never believed that there were people who would object to peace, to a permanent peace. It was that for which we declared throughout the liberty bond campaigns. The burden of our speeches was that this was a war to end all wars, and now we find objection to even moral suasion being used for the purpose of preventing war. Every time one of us made a statement in behalf of liberty bond subscriptions we emphasized that this is a humane war; this is a war of unselfishness on our part; it is a war to save civilization, it is a war to prevent the recurrence of these horrors; and now we find Senators ready to object to any kind of agreement that will put into the treaty some kind of a stipulation that will prevent war or even have a tendency to prevent war.

Mr. President, we may not get the strongest league of nations, but I am in favor of a league of nations, even if there is but one clause contained in its constitution, a declaration that each nation agrees to respect the territorial boundaries of the nations as they exist at the time of the signing of the treaty, and that they are to aid all of the nations in maintaining the same.

We should go further and use our power for the purpose of preventing invasion of any territory of any nation unless the aggressor submits the controversy to a court of arbitration.

If we are able to get only that agreement, we have something that will stop nine-tenths of the wars of the world, because nine-tenths of the wars are for conquest, nine-tenths of the wars are for the purpose of grabbing territory, and if you once obtain an agreement that no nation can invade another, that no nation can take from another any part of its territory, the incentive or inducement for war will cease.

Mr. President, I have been diverted from these figures, and I wish to call attention to them because they show a remarkable record not only as to the troops which were embarked and transported but also as to the manufacture and shipment of war supplies. We began to transport our soldiers in American ships in May, 1917, and we increased the number until in June, 1918, we transported during that month in American bottoms 115,903 of our American soldiers. At the same time we were using the British tonnage and vessels of the other allies.

The total number of soldiers transported in American ships during the war was 896,449. The number transported in British ships was 1,047,374; the number in French ships, 48,691; the number in Italian ships, 61,608.

Mr. President, after the declaration of war we had to pass through both bodies of Congress conscription laws which were long and vigorously fought. We had to give considerable time for the eligible men to register for service. We had to list the 10,000,000 eligible men and give time for the claiming of exemptions and deferred classifications. We had to train the men for actual service by months of drilling. We had to construct enormous cantonments, to build ships, to manufacture guns, artillery, munitions of war, and clothing in gigantic quantities. When we take into consideration all these matters, and the speed with which they were put into the service, ready for fighting upon the battle line, it makes a most remarkable record. There were 2,056,122 of our soldiers transported.

I wish to call attention to other things the War Department has done. The cargoes that were sent to the American Expeditionary Forces from April, 1917, to November 1, 1918, in short tons to the supply service are as follows: I find that there were shipped to France in the Quartermaster's supplies 2,149,400 tons; in engineers' supplies, 1,314,300 tons; in ordnance supplies, 989,900 tons; in the Signal Service, 115,500 tons; in medicinal supplies, 88,900 tons; in the mortar transportation, 113,300 tons;



in the aviation department, 51,400 tons; in Red Cross supplies, 31,900 tons; in the miscellaneous, 43,000 tons; making a total of the shipments of supplies by the War Department to France of 4,897,600 tons.

Is not that a great record? The war came upon us suddenly; the war ended suddenly; and the result of these shipments and the preparation and manufacturing and getting ready of the same is the most remarkable record in the history of the world.

Mr. President, in some of the instances they had to go into the forests and find the spruce and cut it green and season it, and then had to manufacture it into the shapes that they needed. Is it possible that men can fairly say that it should not take time to do those things; that men who worked day and night for the accomplishment of the same should be condemned?

Mr. President, if officials are to be held to account in the degree suggested by the criticism offered here we should require the services of one having the magic of Alladin with his wonderful lamp who can create in an instant great armies and enormous supplies.

I wish also to call attention to something else that was done. Here is the production of munitions for the United States Army from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918. Here were the complete units that were manufactured:

Artillery in complete units, 75-millimeter guns, 932; 3-inch, 75 millimeter AA guns, 97. I shall not read the whole list, but I will get the total. The total is 1,647 cannon that were produced in the United States for the United States Army from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not mean to say that these 75-millimeter guns were made in this country, does he?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I am showing the complete units of these that were made.

Mr. SMOOT. In the United States?

Mr. SHAFROTH. In the United States, production of munitions in the United States for the United States Army from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. How many?

Mr. SHAFROTH. One thousand six hundred and forty-seven.

Here is a list of the complete rounds that were manufactured in the gun factories and in the munition factories of the United States. I shall give the total. These include those for the 75-millimeter guns and for all the artillery. We find that there were 17,203,000 complete rounds for the artillery of the United States that were sent to France.

We had other factories at work; we had other things to do; and the same War Department that seems not to be able to do anything to suit some people, Mr. President, has manufactured of helmets, 1,975,000; of machine guns, 130,000; of machine rifles, 52,000; of rifles, 2,507,000; of pistols and revolvers, 666,000; of rifle and machine-gun ammunition, 2,879,000,000 rounds; of pistol ammunition, 328,000,000 rounds.

Oh, the War Department was sleeping; it was doing nothing; it was absolutely oblivious to the necessity of getting our troops over to France!

Of tractors, it built 32,409; of tanks, 69; of smokeless powder, it manufactured 198,000,000 pounds; of TNT, 101,000,000 pounds; of ammonium nitrate, 91,000,000 pounds; of picric acid, 37,000,000 pounds.

Mr. President, the War Department had other duties to perform. It had to ship and deliver ordnance materials to the American Expeditionary Forces. Here is a statement showing the total amount of complete units that were shipped up to November 15, 1918. There were 454 cannon shipped to our forces; there were British and French deliveries to November 11 of 3,091; a total of 3,545. The amount of artillery ammunition, in complete rounds for the artillery, was 9,066,420.

For the other ordnance the total is not mentioned, but of rifles there were shipped 1,800,000; of pistols and revolvers, 615,000; of machine guns, 49,350; and of machine rifles there were 38,000 shipped.

The rifle ammunition which was shipped was 1,629,300,000 rounds; of pistol and revolver ammunition there were shipped 233,848,000 rounds. Many grenades, tanks, and tractors were also delivered.

Mr. President, they were somewhat busy in doing those things. I want now to state the production of munitions in the United States for Great Britain and for France which were sent over to those countries by the United States:

For Great Britain, field guns, complete units of 361 in the artillery and of extra guns 216.

The limbers and vehicles delivered were 278 in number.

For France there were shipped 70 of the complete units, 525 extra guns, 50 extra carriages, 70 limbers and vehicles.

In artillery ammunition the amounts that were shipped to Great Britain were 3,568,001 rounds; for machinings 2,888,840. Complete rounds for the artillery, 3,577,040 rounds.

Yet the War Department was asleep!

Mr. President, we find that the airplanes which were made between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, were as follows:

Combat De Haviland fours, 3,227.

Combat Handley-Paige, 101.

Training—elementary, 5,346.

Training—advanced, 2,474.

Making a total of 11,148 airplanes which were shipped overseas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. Just a moment. Those were the figures of production. Of those shipped overseas, the first were 1,985.

Mr. REED. What were they?

Mr. SHAFROTH. They were combat De Haviland fours. Combat Handley-Paige (parts), 100; training—elementary, 0; training—advanced, 0; making a total of 1,985.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. Let me finish the figures in regard to the engines, and then I will yield to the Senator. There were produced of combat—Liberty motors, 13,554; shipped overseas, 4,388. Combat—Hispano, 469; shipped overseas, 245. Training—elementary engines, 10,568; shipped overseas, 0. Training—advance, 5,221; shipped overseas, 200; making a total product in the United States between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, of 29,832, and shipped overseas, 4,828.

Now I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I merely desire to know if the War Department has furnished those figures to the Senator as an actual representation of the airplane situation?

Mr. SHAFROTH. At the time of November 11, 1918; yes, sir.

Mr. REED. I charge that they are deliberately misleading as to the facts.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know about that.

Mr. REED. I charge that the investigation made by the Military Committee made an absolute demonstration that up to the time the war closed our airplane program was a substantial failure. I am sorry to have to say this. I have made no attack upon the War Department except for failure to bring back our soldiers; but I say to the Senator from Colorado that if the War Department has the insolence to send figures of that kind here in regard to the airplane situation it needs checking up, and it will get it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The airplane program, which was made the subject of debate in this body, was behind in April, May, and June of last year because an immense amount of work had to be done by way of preparation. Factories had to be erected, railroads built to the forests; they had to cut the spruce timber green in the forests, to season it, and then to manufacture it into forms. All that takes time, and of course they could not have, and did not have at that time, the number which we anticipated and hoped they would have; but that shows no inefficiency; it merely shows they were behind in their contracts; it shows, as a matter of fact, that they were doing good work.

Mr. President, I want show another thing which the War Department has done. I desire to say to the Senator from Missouri, whose reference was only to the bringing back of the soldiers, that the equipping of the soldiers has been criticized in this body almost continually. I have some data here with reference to the United States squadrons at the front. A squadron is equipped with from 15 to 25 airplanes. On April 30, 1918, we had 3; on May 31, we had 12; on June 30, 1918, we had 13; on July 31, 1918, we had 14; on August 31 we had 26; on September 30 we had 32; on October 31 we had 43; and on November 11, 1918, we had 45.

A comparison of enemy planes brought down by the United States forces and United States planes brought down by enemy forces will show that the United States planes lost to the enemy were 271, while the enemy planes lost to the United States numbered 491. That shows a record of efficiency on the part of our soldiers which was more than twice that of the German Army, which had been supposed to be, and has been heralded to be, the most expert, the best equipped, and the most perfect military organization in the world.

Mr. President, there was something else done by the War Department. I refer to railroad transportation equipment produced and shipped to the American Expeditionary Forces from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918. Of standard-gauge locomotives there were produced 1,691. Does it not take some time to build locomotives? Of that number there were shipped overseas, 1,141. Of narrow-gauge locomotives 445 were pro-



duced, and 406 were shipped overseas. Of standard-gauge cars 19,516 were manufactured and 16,372 shipped overseas. It takes time to manufacture cars; it takes time to construct locomotives; it takes time to make cars of both narrow-gauge and standard-gauge pattern. Yet we did all this in 18 months, without any preparation whatever.

As to automobile transportation, of two-wheel-drive trucks, 55,563 were produced and 30,417 were shipped overseas in 18 months. It takes time to make automobiles and it takes time to transport them 3,000 miles from our shores. It takes time to get them from the factory to the seaboard, especially in view of the fact that the railroads of this country were congested to such an extent that the shipments could not get to the port of departure without long delay; yet it is said that we were sleeping on our job.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator mean now to argue that we are entitled to any glorious record on account of trucks? Let me read a telegram from Gen. Pershing.

Mr. SHAFROTH. On account of what?

Mr. REED. On account of trucks.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well.

Mr. REED. The telegram to which I refer is as follows:

OCTOBER 13.

Subparagraph (a)—

Failure to float reconnaissance and staff observation cars, to fill tonnage allotment, resulting in improper equipment of regiments and uneconomical diversion of passenger vehicles urgently needed for other purposes. Vehicles should be available and tonnage allotted, but only 55 reconnaissance cars and 75 staff observation cars arrived or were reported by ships during September and October. Please cable prospect for balance for October and November.

Failure to float light repair trucks greatly handicapped repair ordnance work. General motor transport situation does not permit diverting other transports for this purpose. Two hundred and sixty-four reported shipped in August and others presumably available. Tonnage allotments made and total arrivals or reported by ships to date, only 114.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I really do not see any criticism in that, except that they were in a hurry and, of course, anybody who needs equipment of any kind is anxious to get it. That is simply a request to have it expedited.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator see any criticism in the statement of the shortage? Does he see any criticism in this—

On account of the nonarrival of motor transport and animals as heretofore requested, our situation with respect to animal transport is becoming increasingly and alarmingly serious.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That may be true, but England had been in the war for four years trying to do things, and her supplies were short also.

Mr. REED. But the Senator has just been arguing that everything was supplied; and when I start to read him of a serious shortage, he replies that England was also short. Now, what does the Senator say to this one line? I presume he will also reply that England did something—

Unless supplies are furnished when cabled for, our armies will cease to operate.

PERSHING.

Does that sound very encouraging?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, Mr. President, of course we were anxious to get our soldiers over there, and no doubt Gen. Pershing was also; and, as shown by the statement I have here, the number of soldiers we transported overseas from April to November amounted, in the respective months, to 117,244, 277,000, 306,000, 281,000, 251,000, 174,000, and 30,000. Of course, if Gen. Pershing had stated, "I want 5,000,000 troops," we could not have forwarded them; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. REED. I was not talking about troops.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, the same thing is true as to supplies. They have to be manufactured; it is necessary to have the bottoms in which to ship them; many things have to be done, and, unless a person knows the exact situation, he can not appreciate the magnitude of the undertaking.

Mr. REED. I know that some things were done, and some things were not done.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes.

Mr. REED. What I am replying to is this pretense of the department that they have done everything so marvelously well; and, when I show that there was a shortage, the Senator replies that England perhaps did not do as well. That is hardly an answer.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, it is an answer, because all things are relative; there is no doubt about that. If a demand is made for something before it can be obtained or manufactured, it is absurd to say that there is negligence on the part of anybody for not immediately sending it.

Mr. REED. The Senator claims that they performed their duty perfectly—

Mr. SHAFROTH. No.

Mr. REED. And then, when it is shown that it was performed imperfectly he says that everything is imperfect.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I mean to say that their undertakings were more nearly perfect than similar undertakings of any other nation that ever attempted such a task.

Now, Mr. President, as to four-wheel drive trucks, the number produced in the United States was 16,934, and the number shipped overseas, 9,420. Of ambulances there were 10,893 produced, and 6,981 shipped overseas. Of motor cars 17,666 were produced, and 6,989 shipped overseas. Of motorcycles 28,310 were produced, and 16,188 shipped overseas.

Mr. President, the War Department had also other duties to perform, and I wish to call attention to some of them. Here is the list of "Clothing and equipage stocks overseas November 1, 1918":

Stocks on hand in France and days' supply based on Gen. Pershing's new automatic allowances, effective November 1, 1918:

Number of blankets in United States, 4,294,000. Stock overseas, 1,119,000.

Number of days 2,000,000 men could be supplied with stock overseas in blankets, 425; in jerkins, 159 days.

Coats, stock in United States, 3,991,000. Stock overseas, 1,419,000.

Number of days 2,000,000 men could be supplied with stock overseas, 154.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator know that a great many of those were made by Spain and England and France?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; not those that were shipped overseas.

Mr. SMOOT. They were overseas, it is true; but the Senator knows that we have spent now about \$30,000,000,000, and we certainly ought to get something for that \$30,000,000,000; and the Senator must know, if he knows where that clothing for overseas service was made, that a great part of it was made in England and Spain and France.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The criticism has been continual—

Mr. SMOOT. I am not criticizing at all.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator has been giving a thrust once in a while; that is all.

Mr. SMOOT. But when the Senator stands up here and gives the Senate information, and leads them to believe that all these things were made in the United States, I can not agree with him.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I read the title as to what this was.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. SHAFROTH. And this is what I say the War Department reports under that title.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt that they had those things on hand, but American money purchased them from foreign countries.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Why, certainly American money paid for them. We pay for our things. If we had had a shortage of a few blankets, we would have heard something from Senators upon that subject. If we had had a shortage of coats, we would have heard Senators, in a chorus of denunciation, proclaiming against the stupidity of the War Department. I do not know where the articles came from, but I do know they were there, and they were ready for the service of the soldiers.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator really invites criticism, I could say to him that it could be based upon the very things that the Senator has just mentioned; but I am not criticizing. What I wanted to do was to give the Government all the money that could possibly be spent, and I wanted them to get the goods wherever they could get them in the world; but I do not want credit given where credit is not due.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The heading of this was read. It gives this statement:

Clothing and equipage stocks overseas November 1, 1918.

Stocks on hand in France and days' supply based on Gen. Pershing's new automatic allowances effective November 1, 1918.

Now, whether they were purchased in Spain or whether they were purchased in the United States, I do not know; but we know that a great many were purchased in the United States.

We find that in the case of drawers the stock in the United States was 15,746,000, which must have been made in America, and the stock overseas was 5,304,000, enough to supply the Army in France for 202 days.

I do not want to go through all of this list of supplies purchased by the War Department for the Army.

In the supply of stockings, there were in the United States 16,290,000 pairs, and 8,753,000 pairs were overseas.

In the stock of coats, 4,142,000 were made, and 2,141,000 were in stock overseas.

This includes all of the furnishings and stock on hand, both for the soldiers in the cantonments and the soldiers in France.

There were 8,850,000 pairs of shoes in stock in the United States, and 2,033,000 pairs overseas. That shows evidently



that there were manufactured in the United States at least 6,000,000 pairs of shoes, because that is the total stock now in the United States; and if you take that comparison you will find that very few of these goods, compared to the total manufactured in the United States, were manufactured in foreign countries. England had soldiers to supply. Spain did not; but Spain is not a great manufacturing country.

In the case of gloves, there were 3,734,000 pairs in stock in the United States, and 2,682,000 overseas.

In the case of overcoats, the stock in the United States was 3,691,000, and the stock overseas was 477,000.

In the case of raincoats, the stock in the United States was 1,620,000 and 550,000 overseas.

Winter undershirts, 13,806,000.

Mittens, 3,070,000.

Caps, 2,931,000.

As to diseases in the Army, I saw an account in a newspaper the other day showing by far the smallest percentage of deaths among our soldiers compared to the deaths from disease in the Civil and Spanish-American Wars, notwithstanding the fact that the most fatal epidemic known for centuries had existed during the last six months of the war.

Mr. President, such is part of the record of the War Department, and it demonstrates that there is no comparison between what the United States has done in the period of one year and a half and the results shown by other nations covering a much longer period of time.

I have always felt that when officers of the Government are endeavoring earnestly to do their duty, when they are working day and night for the success of this great war, they should not be subjected to the condemnation and the criticisms which have been made concerning their actions. No man is perfect; no man can do everything in the short time that is available for preparation for a great war; but we do know that here is a record giving each particular item, and I challenge comparison with any other nation as against that which was done by our own United States. This applies not only to the Secretary of War, whose record has been phenomenal, but it applies to all the other departments that have bent their energies toward the success of this great victory which we have achieved in behalf of liberty and civilization.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to make a suggestion to him?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In behalf of the War Department, let me say that we have nine days more of this session of Congress. We have 14 supply bills necessary to pass to run the Government. The Army bill came over here this morning. Unless we make some progress, there will be no money with which to run the War Department in any way. Now, I was very much interested in the figures that the Senator read; but those bulletins from the War Department have come down here regularly for the last six months, and I was going to make this suggestion in order that we might pass the appropriation bills that are necessary to take care of the Army.

The Navy Department have a very good provision in the legislative bill. They provide an appropriation for the Navy to write its own history of this war. It might be well for those interested in the War Department to supplement that appropriation by providing an amount for the War Department to write its own history, instead of sending in bulletins; and then we might get right down to business and pass the appropriation bills.

I want to suggest to those who are interested in the War Department that we might compromise this matter, so that we could attend to business, by providing for an appropriation to authorize the War Department to write its own history; and I shall be very glad to accept that amendment, if the Senator or somebody else interested will offer it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I am one of the Members of this body who very seldom occupy the attention of the Senate. I never make a long speech. I have spoken about an hour, and the tirade against the administration occupied from 15 minutes of 1 o'clock until 15 minutes of 5 o'clock.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I assure the Senator that I am not discussing him in this connection. I am talking about the bulletins that come down here. This is only one of a number.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; that may be. I had no intention of speaking to-day or at any other time upon this subject; but while Senators were laying emphasis upon the large numbers of soldiers in cantonments and the lack of excuse for not releasing them I went to the telephone and obtained the exact number; and the real facts, which, added to the information contained in this document made up by the War Department, show a record of efficiency that is marvelous, indeed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in my remarks in the Record the tables to which I referred.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

*Clothing and equipage stocks overseas, Nov. 1, 1918.*

STOCKS ON HAND IN FRANCE AND DAYS' SUPPLY BASED ON GEN. PERSHING'S NEW AUTOMATIC ALLOWANCES, EFFECTIVE NOV. 1, 1918.

	Stock in United States.	Stock overseas.	Number of days 2,000,000 men could be supplied with stock overseas.
Blankets.....	4,294,000	1,119,000	425
Drawers, winter.....	15,746,000	5,304,000	202
Jerkins.....	1,405,000	1,044,000	139
Coats, denim.....	3,991,000	1,419,000	154
Puttees, woolen.....	5,231,000	3,356,000	149
Trousers, denim.....	3,374,000	1,842,000	140
Boots, rubber, hip.....	1,193,000	551,000	140
Shirts, flannel.....	6,710,000	3,033,000	135
Stockings, wool, heavy.....	16,293,000	8,753,000	134
Coats, wool.....	4,142,000	2,141,000	125
Shoes, field.....	8,850,000	2,033,000	103
Gloves, wool.....	3,734,000	2,682,000	82
Paulins.....	38,000	21,000	80
Breeches and trousers, wool.....	6,791,000	1,789,000	75
Overcoats.....	3,691,000	477,000	73
Raincoats.....	1,620,000	550,000	59
Undershirts, winter.....	13,806,000	1,231,000	55
Mittens, leather.....	3,070,000	664,000	51
Caps, overseas.....	2,931,000	189,000	14

#### PUBLIC-LAND ENTRIES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3797) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. MYERS. I ask leave that the reading of the amendments may be dispensed with. I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendments, and request a conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not like to interrupt the Senator from Montana in reference to this particular bill, but there is an appropriation bill before the Senate which was reported some days ago, and it has been before the Senate the entire day and no progress has been made on it.

Mr. MYERS. This is just a request for a conference.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I expect to move an adjournment at half past 6 o'clock, so that these matters may be taken up in the morning hour to-morrow. There are but nine days left of this session, and I think the Senate ought to give some opportunity for the consideration of the supply bills that it is necessary to have passed.

Mr. MYERS. This will take only a minute.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I intend to move that the Senate adjourn at half past 6 o'clock, so that Senators may have an opportunity to bring up these matters in the morning hour to-morrow.

Mr. MYERS. But I can not do it then. This has no place in the morning hour. There is no heading of business at all for it. This is a privileged question, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS in the chair). This is a message from the House and is a privileged communication, as the Chair understands. The Senate has heard the motion of the Senator from Montana that the Senate refuse to concur in the House amendments and asks for a conference with the House.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MYERS, Mr. RANSDELL, and Mr. SMOOT conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14078) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

#### DEMOBILIZATION OF TROOPS.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am very sorry to take a minute or so, particularly after the remarks of the Senator in charge of this bill; and I think his remarks are entirely justified.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They were not personal at all.

Mr. REED. I know they were not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I simply wanted to proceed with the appropriation bill; that is all.

Mr. REED. In what I said this afternoon I undertook to call attention not to the general shortcomings of the War Department but to the fact that our soldiers are being held in



camp and that they are not being sent home as rapidly as we want them—at least, not as rapidly as some of us want them. I did not undertake a criticism of the way in which the War Department had conducted the war.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I did not say that the Senator had. I was criticizing generally the statements that had been made in the last two or three months in this Chamber, principally by Senators upon the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. REED. Well, the Senator got me so confused and mixed with Senators on the other side and with the criticism that I confess I could not differentiate between myself and them; but that is all right. The Senator never means to do an injustice to anybody, and I know he would not do one to me.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No, sir.

Mr. REED. But I wish to take a minute to call attention to the fact that every time anybody calls attention to anything that is wrong the cry is always raised, "You are criticizing everything that is done." That is the cloak under which refuge is taken in every case.

Now, I want it understood that the Congress has a right to criticize. It is true that there are a good many men who have lost the power of criticism. There are some men who are under some kind of hypnotic influence that has made it impossible for them to do anything except to exclaim, "Me, too!" to every proposition which comes over to them. They stand in the light of the great white throne of glory, blinded, and they do whatever they are told to do, regardless of their opinions. In fact, they cease to have any opinions. Now, that is just a little nauseating, and I do not wonder that the Congress comes into the contempt of the public and into the contempt of the Executive. I do not think it is the business of Congress to stand here and pick flaws with everything, but neither do I think it is the business of Congress to do nothing but stand here in the attitude of glorification, singing "Te Deum laudamus."

The thing that I want to say at this moment is that I am sorry the War Department is sending out any such mess of figures as it gave here to-day. I am sorry it has resorted to it. There were many good things done in this war; many things were splendidly done; but I will tell you that the best job that was done in this war was not done by the War Department. It was done in the homes of America, where there was raised the best material for soldiers that God ever put on this earth. That job was not done by the War Department. Another thing the War Department did not do: It did not produce the wealth of this country. That was produced by the people.

Now, far be it from me to stand here and harshly criticize. Many things may be praised, but when the War Department sends in figures here, trying to convince this body and the country that every supply was on hand, that everything was just as it ought to be, that it performed miracles, that it had airplanes that darkened the skies, and all that sort of stuff, it is not telling the truth, and it is not reflecting any credit upon itself.

I am going to read a telegram, and I have a lot more like it. I am just going to read it to show how misleading figures can be:

SEPTEMBER 13.

Experience of last three months, during which our tonnage receipts fell far short of our expectations, made it necessary to call attention in most positive terms to conditions which have resulted—

Mr. SMOOT. Was that in 1918?

Mr. REED. Oh, yes.

It has been necessary to place combatant troops in the lines shortly after their arrival in France. Divisions have at intervals been employed in quiet or active sectors according to their degree of training, but all must be employed if we are to reap full advantage of the present favorable situation. In most essential articles of engineer and quartermaster equipment we are over our estimated allotments for June, July, and August, but all other departments are short in percentages figured on a tonnage allotment basis, as follows: Ordnance Department, 33 per cent; Signal Corps, 52 per cent; Chemical Warfare Service, 51 per cent; Medical Corps, 23 per cent; Motor Transport, 81 per cent; and railroad transportation, 20 per cent. At the present time our ability to supply and maneuver our forces depends largely on motor transportation. The shortage in motor transportation is particularly embarrassing, now due to the shortage of horses for our horse-drawn transports. We are able to carry out present plans due to the fact—

Now, notice this—

that we have been able to borrow, temporarily, large numbers of trucks and ambulances from the French. We have also borrowed 15 American ambulance sections from Italy. The shortage of ambulances to move our wounded is critical. Attention is called to our shortage in motor transportation, as contained in our cable 1606, subparagraph A. These shortages have been augmented by troops arriving since that time. In this connection attention is called to the fact that we have already been called upon to equip with motor transportation 8 of the 10 divisions which have come over to us from the British.

We have reached the point where we can no longer improvise or borrow. The most important plans and operations depend upon certainty that the home Government will deliver at French port material

and equipment called for. It is urged that foregoing be given most serious consideration and that tonnage allotted for supply of Army in France be sufficient to deliver material and equipment properly proportioned in kind and amounts to meet the needs of our troops. The need of motor transportation is urgent. It is not understood why greater advantage has not been taken of deck space to ship motor trucks. Trucks do not overburden dock accommodations nor require railroad transportation, which in fact it relieves. Can you not impress this upon shipping authorities?

PERSHING.

Now, I have a stack of these here, and I do not intend to read them, for there is no use encouraging people, but I do not want very much more of this stuff sent over by the War Department or I will read it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say merely one word at this time about the custom that has grown up in the departments here in Washington. There is not a citizen in the United States who does not know that there has been some splendid work done by every one of our departments. We have had some officials in the departments who could not have done better, and no one else could have done more than they did, but there were other officials who were a total failure, and it ill becomes anyone to try to make an excuse for them.

I have noticed of late that if there is a criticism either in the House or in the Senate the same parties who are criticized send up a load of stuff from the departments and get some one to get up in the Senate or the House and read it as an excuse. I think that that practice ought to be stopped. Senators can get all the information they desire at any time they wish it without having some little official down in one of the departments who has been criticized, as soon as he hears about it, send a telephone message up and send a whole lot of stuff to encumber the Record.

I am one who has not uttered a word of criticism in relation to the war and the caring for every department of it, but that does not mean that I do not know that there have been criminal mistakes. That does not mean that I do not know the waste has been indefensible, and the people's money has been squandered by the hundreds of millions of dollars, and there has not been any return from it. My whole thought and idea was to win the war, and I did not care if the head of a department came before the Appropriations Committee and asked for a billion dollars; I did not go into the question as to whether it was all wanted immediately or not; I made the statement upon the floor of the Senate that I was going to vote for all that was asked, and I would hold the administration responsible for the expenditure of the money. The time will come when they will have to answer for it, Mr. President. If it is well spent, the American people will know it, and if it has been squandered in any way the American people will be advised of it.

#### AMERICAN SHIPPING PROBLEM.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that when the Senate convenes on Monday, the 24th instant, I shall present a brief diagnosis of the American shipping problem arising out of the recent world war.

#### MARKET PRICE OF LIBERTY BONDS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to refer for just a moment to the statement made by the chairman of the Finance Committee with reference to liberty bonds. It is a good ways from that in the Record now, but he made one statement that I do not think ought to be passed over without notice. He stated that all those who purchased the 3½ per cent liberty bonds did it knowing that the bonds would go below par.

Mr. President, those who are accustomed to dealing in bonds probably knew that, but in my judgment the great mass of the people who purchased a small amount of bonds—a \$50 bond or a \$100 bond—did not know it. As a matter of fact, men went all over this country stating from public platforms that every man who bought a \$50 bond was simply investing \$50, and he would get that \$50 back with the interest whenever he wanted it. That was uttered by four-minute men all over the country, by representatives of the Government, by Senators and Representatives in Congress, and by the Secretary of the Treasury himself in his trips throughout the country. As I said, the men who are accustomed to deal in bonds probably knew that they would be below par, but the ordinary citizen in purchasing those bonds thought he was getting \$50 worth when he got a \$50 bond.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, bearing upon the point which the Senator from Washington has called to the attention of the Senate, I desire to have the Secretary read a letter which I have received in reference to the bonds and the price at which they are selling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS in the chair). The Secretary will read as requested.



The Secretary read as follows:

SLAB FORK COAL CO.,  
Slab Fork, W. Va., February 17, 1919.

Hon. HOWARD SUTHERLAND,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: From the papers I see that Mr. Glass, Secretary of the Treasury, has asked Congress to place before the people in April a so-called victory loan.

I supported four liberty loans and will support the victory loan. But unless either Congress or Secretary Glass does something to raise the liberty bonds scattered about the country to par, I fear we of Raleigh County, W. Va., will have a hard time raising our quota.

The four-minute men and others led the people to believe that bonds were money, and the United States liberty bonds would all be of the same value. Since work has gone to the bad many miners are selling their bonds, and don't understand why a \$50 bond is only worth \$46 or thereabouts. The bond sharks are doing a thriving business. I understand that \$50 bonds have sold at Slab Fork for \$35.

Many business men who subscribed for \$1,000 to \$5,000 of bonds are worried over the market condition of the bonds and are not as enthusiastic about the coming victory loan as we would like to have them. And if this victory loan bond is made so inviting that it will drive the liberties lower on the market I very much fear the mining world will do but little, if anything, in the coming victory drive.

Exempt all liberty bonds from taxes. Give the same rate of interest for liberty bonds and victory bonds and you will restore confidence and invite thrift.

Yours, truly,

W. GASTON CAPEBTON,  
General Manager.

#### LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14078) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill at line 24, on page 43, and read as follows:

Bureau of War Risk Insurance: For expenses of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, as authorized by law: For salaries of the director and commissioners, and of such deputies, assistants, accountants, experts, clerks, and other employees in the District of Columbia as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary, \$9,509,630; stationery and minor office supplies, \$150,000; miscellaneous expenses, including telephones, telegrams, freight, express, foreign postage, not exceeding \$100 for street car fares, and not exceeding \$500 for law books, books of reference, and periodicals, \$25,000; printing and binding, to be done at the Government Printing Office, and necessary printing of forms, etc., for use abroad may be done abroad, \$125,000; furniture, equipment, and supplies, \$175,000; traveling expenses (exclusive of field investigations), \$5,000; salaries and expenses of employees engaged in field investigations and expenses of not more than eight temporary branch offices, \$1,000,000; in all, \$10,989,630: *Provided*, That all employees appropriated for by this paragraph shall be engaged exclusively on the work of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance during the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator from Alabama that I never noticed when the bill was under consideration by the committee the item in line 13, on page 44, "exclusive of field investigation," \$5,000 for traveling expenses. I thought all travel allowances were for field investigations. This is new, is it not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will have to look into the matter. I will say to the Senator I do not remember whether it was carried in last year's bill or not.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not a copy of last year's bill before me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will find it in a minute. I am inclined to think that this is a reappropriation.

Mr. WARREN. If it were in the last bill it would be noted in the committee print, would it not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator that that is the current law; it is the customary language.

Mr. SMOOT. I have just turned to the committee print and I see that those words were used in the last year's appropriation bill. I see it was put in by the House and I will not object to it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill whether he is satisfied with the wording of the provision, beginning on line 9, page 44, which reads:

Printing and binding, to be done at the Government Printing Office, and necessary printing of forms, etc., for use abroad may be done abroad, \$125,000.

It does not seem to me that that conveys a clear intention. It provides that the work shall be done at the Government Printing Office and then that it may be done abroad if for use abroad.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is a general law that all printing of that class shall be done at the Government Printing Office. There is an exception made in this particular case where it is impossible to do it at the Government Printing Office. I think that is all.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Would it not be necessary, then, to separate the items and provide specifically for printing abroad?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This language has been carried in the bill, as it is now, for some years and never has given any trouble. We have operated under it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask the Senator in charge of the bill with reference to line 15. It reads:

Salaries and expenses of employees engaged in field investigations and expenses of not more than eight temporary branch offices, \$1,000,000.

Where are these temporary branch offices? What are they for? Why are they temporary?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator will pardon me for just a moment. If I can turn to the hearing I can give more full information. My understanding is that there were certain temporary offices to aid in the expedition of the work of classification and investigation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Where were they located?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will not read all the hearing, but this will give an idea. The Senator will find the same matter was discussed by Mr. Brown, who was then acting chief of this bureau, and Mr. Nesbit, on page 1019 of the hearings before the House committee. This throws light on it. It is stated on page 1020 by Mr. Nesbit:

At least 40,000 allotments and allowances are paid to people in foreign countries—15,000 in Italy, 2,500 in Greece, and in 15 or 16 other foreign countries. These cases all require investigation.

These outside offices were established for the purpose of investigating the validity of the claims for allowances.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Those offices are really in other countries.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My understanding is that some of them are in the United States; that not all of them are in foreign countries, but a part are in foreign countries and a part in this country. It is to facilitate the question of investigation as to whether the allotments were valid and not fraudulent.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suppose that they were considered necessary during the exigencies of the war, and when we get down to a normal basis they are expected to be done away with.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I suppose when the war is over and we get down to a normal basis a very large proportion of the machinery of this office and the expensive work will be abolished, although the office itself will be a permanent office in the future.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; and there will be a very large force too.

Mr. President, I simply want to say that, as the Senator understands, when this bill was brought out of the subcommittee it was put through the full committee very speedily, and some of us at work elsewhere did not have an opportunity to go over the bill very fully when it was reported from the subcommittee. While I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations I did not have an opportunity to participate very much in the consideration of the bill. As I said, it was called up and hurried through, and my recollection is in the afternoon when the Senate was in session. There were some matters I had to look after and I could not be there. If I ask questions about some of the items that is the reason why.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I am only too glad to give any information that I can in reference to this bill. I am only too glad to have the attention of the Senate directed to the bill. This bill takes care of the salaries of all the executive departments of the Government and it would be very hard for the Government to run without it. We have been in session to-day for over six hours. We have read one page of the bill. At this rate I think we will get through probably a dozen pages before the 4th of March, but as long as the time is occupied in the consideration of the bill I have no objection at all.

Mr. President, I am going to move for an executive session for a few minutes, as one of the Senators desires to refer a nomination. That will take only a minute. Then I wish to announce when that is over I intend to move that the Senate take an adjournment until 11 o'clock to-morrow, but I want to ask the Senate as far as this particular bill is concerned, if it is possible, to let us get down to-morrow and really consider the bill, because I think it really would be a reflection on the Senate if we finally scrapped these great supply bills without a reasonable effort to pass them.

In the last analysis, Mr. President, the principal business to which Congress should direct its efforts is to pass the revenue bills to raise the money to run the Government and to pass the supply bills that will take care of the machinery and operations of the Government; and very little along that line has been done at this session of Congress.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to



the bill (S. 4723) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12211) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 15835) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 15835. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After four minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move that the Senate adjourn until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 20, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 19, 1919.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, for the brave men who answered the call of the colors when the world was imperiled, and those who braved the dangers of the ocean, who did their work and did it well, and are now returning to the land they love, with new laurels added to the American soldier, with Old Glory upheld and sustained through the perilous fight—her stars and stripes still streaming o'er us with added luster.

Some are coming back strong and well, others sick and wounded. Some are left where they fell on the field of carnage.

May those who come back have a warm welcome and be held in sacred memory by all true lovers of liberty.

God grant that the principles they fought for may live and be a blessing to mankind. Grant that the dead may live in our memory, the wounded be ours to care for. In Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BARNHART, for one day, on account of illness.

#### LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY ADDRESS OF MR. SLOAN.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an address by Hon. CHARLES H. SLOAN, of Nebraska, on the life and character of Lincoln before the Grand Army of the Republic, the Woman's Relief Corps, and other patriotic organizations.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] on Lincoln's Birthday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### HON. JOUETT SHOUSE.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the appointment of my colleague, Hon. JOUETT SHOUSE, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks leave to print in the RECORD a speech about his colleague, Mr. SHOUSE, becoming Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bill and joint resolutions of the following titles:

S. 3646. An act to grant rights of way over Government lands for dam and reservoir purposes, for the conservation and storage of water to be used by the city of San Diego, Cal., and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on the public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to Francis Asbury; and

S. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution providing that one term of the United States District Court for the Eastern Judicial District of Oklahoma shall be held annually at Hugo, Okla.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 13462) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments and had appointed Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. RANDELL, and Mr. JONES of Washington as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD.

Mr. GOULD. Mr. Speaker, I move to discharge the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries from consideration of House resolution 562, calling upon the President for certain information in accordance with section 12 of the shipping act approved September 7, 1916.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send up the resolution, and it will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to report to the House of Representatives for its information all the facts within the knowledge of the United States Shipping Board, as required to be reported by section 12 of the act entitled "An act to establish a United States Shipping Board, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, including the recommendations made by the United States Shipping Board relating to seamen's wages, equalization of the higher cost, if any, of building ships in American yards, and the method or policy adopted for operating American ships in competition with foreign-owned ships, whether by the United States Government or by private corporations or individual American citizens; also full information as to the plans which have been adopted for providing stations for furnishing fuel for United States vessels in all parts of the world.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the point of order that the resolution is not privileged. What committee has the resolution been referred to?

Mr. MANN. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It strikes me from hearing it read that it calls for a question of policy. Of course I have not seen a copy of the resolution.

Mr. MANN. I will give the gentleman a copy. The gentleman's impression is a very natural one, from listening to the reading of the resolution; but what the resolution calls for is a statement of fact as to recommendations which have been made by the Shipping Board as to certain subjects. That is purely a question of fact.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman understands that I was merely reserving the point of order until I could read the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Certainly, I understand; but what it calls for is recommendations, among other things, which have been made as to equalization of costs, the payment of seamen's wages, and the policy to be pursued, so it does not call for any conclusions.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I see now that it does not call for any explanations, but merely for facts.

Mr. MANN. It calls for recommendations which have already been made.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I withdraw the point of order. The SPEAKER. The question is on discharging the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries from further consideration of the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

#### RETENTION OF UNIFORMS BY SOLDIERS.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that H. R. 13366, known as the bill for the retention of uniforms by the soldiers, be laid before the House, and that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.



The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 13366) permitting any person who has served in the United States Army or Marine Corps in the present war to retain his uniform and personal equipment, and to wear the same under certain conditions, with Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. DENT, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. KAHN.

#### POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANN. Is not the gentleman willing to let that go over until to-morrow morning?

Mr. MOON. We are very anxious to get through with this. I do not think it will take over half an hour.

Mr. MANN. Very well.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

Mr. MOON. I ask unanimous consent to read the statement in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to have the statement read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the House conferees.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1088).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 36, 39, 40, 41, and 49.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, and 73, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following:

"That hereafter all days, other than the holidays enumerated in the act of July 28, 1916, making appropriations for the Postal Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, set aside by the President of the United States as holidays to be observed by the other departments of the Government throughout the United States shall be construed as applicable to the Postal Service in the same manner and to the same extent as the executive departments."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following:

"That out of this appropriation the Postmaster General is authorized to expend not exceeding \$850,500 for the purchase of aeroplanes and the operation and maintenance of aeroplane mail service between such points, including service to and between points in Alaska, as he may determine. The Postmaster General in expending this appropriation shall purchase, as far as practicable, such available and suitable equipment and supplies for the aeroplane mail service as may be owned by or under construction for the War Department or the Navy Department when no longer required because of the cessation of war activities, and it shall be his duty to first ascertain if such articles of the character described may be secured from the War Department or the Navy Department before purchasing such equipment or supplies elsewhere. If such equipment or supplies, other than emergency supplies, are purchased elsewhere than from the War Department or the Navy Department, the Postmaster General shall report such action to Congress, together with the reasons for such purchases. All articles purchased from either of said departments shall be paid for at a reasonable price considering

wear and tear and general condition. Said departments are authorized to sell such equipment and supplies to the Post Office Department under the conditions specified, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are hereby authorized and directed to deliver immediately to the Postmaster General, as he may request, and as hereinbefore provided, such aeroplane machines, supplies, equipment, and parts as may be serviceable and available for the aeroplane mail service, the same to be out of any equipment that the War Department or the Navy Department has on hand or under construction, the War Department and the Navy Department appropriations to be credited with the equipment turned over to the Post Office Department: *And provided further*, That separate accounts be kept of the amount expended for aeroplane mail service."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following:

"*Provided*, That hereafter rural carriers assigned to horse-drawn vehicle routes on which daily service is performed shall receive \$24 per mile per annum for each mile said routes are in excess of 24 miles or major fraction thereof, based on actual mileage, and rural carriers assigned to horse-drawn vehicle routes on which triweekly service is performed shall receive \$12 per mile per annum for each mile said routes are in excess of 24 miles or major fraction thereof, based on actual mileage: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1920 the pay of carriers who furnish and maintain their own motor vehicles and who serve routes not less than 50 miles in length may be fixed at not exceeding \$2,250 per annum."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed by the Senate restore the word "herein," at the end of line 15 on page 28, and add the following: "*Provided further*, That no assistant postmaster or supervisory official at offices of the first class shall receive a less salary than \$100 per annum in excess of the sixth-grade salary provided for clerks and carriers in the City Delivery Service, nor shall an assistant postmaster at any office of the second class be paid a less salary than that paid the highest-salaried clerk or letter carrier employed in such office: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to employees who receive a part of their pay from any outside sources under cooperative arrangement with the Post Office Department, or to employees who serve voluntarily or receive only a nominal compensation: *And provided further*, That the increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent and 15 per cent for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and the increased compensation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, shall not be computed as salary in construing this section. So much as may be necessary for the increases provided for in this act is hereby appropriated"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"Sec. 5. That the act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes,' approved July 11, 1916, is hereby amended to provide that the term 'rural post roads,' as used in section 2 of said act, shall be construed to mean any public road a major portion of which is now used or can be used, or forms a connecting link not to exceed 10 miles in length of any road or roads now or hereafter used for the transportation of the United States mails, excluding every street and road in a place having a population, as shown by the latest available Federal census, of 2,500 or more, except that portion of any such street or road along which the houses average more than 200 feet apart: *Provided*, That section 6 of said act be further amended so that the limitation of payments not to exceed \$10,000 per mile, exclusive of the cost of bridges of more than 20 feet clear span, which the Secretary of Agriculture may make, be, and the same is, increased to \$20,000 per mile.

"Sec. 6. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of said act, as herein amended, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following additional sums: The sum of \$50,000,000 for the fiscal



year ending June 30, 1919, and available immediately; the sum of \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; and the sum of \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921; said additional sums to be expended in accordance with the provisions of said act: *Provided*, That where the constitution of any State prohibits the same from engaging upon internal improvements, or from contracting public debts for extraordinary purposes in an amount sufficient to meet the monetary requirements of the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, or restricts annual tax levies for the purpose of constructing and improving roads and bridges, and where a constitutional alteration or amendment to overcome either or all of such prohibitions must be submitted to a referendum at a general election, the sum to which such State is entitled under the method of apportionment provided in the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, shall be withdrawn by the Secretary of the Treasury from the principal fund appropriated by the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, upon receipt of the certification of the governor of such State to the existence of either or all of said prohibitions, and such sum shall be carried by the Secretary of the Treasury as a separate fund for future disbursement as hereinafter provided: *Provided further*, That when, by referendum, the constitutional alterations or amendments necessary to the enjoyment of the sum so withdrawn have been approved and ratified by any State, the Secretary of the Treasury, upon receipt of certification from the governor of such State to such effect, shall immediately make available to such State, for the purposes set forth in the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, the sum withdrawn as hereinbefore provided: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be deemed to prevent any State from receiving such portion of said principal sum as is available under its existing constitution and laws: *Provided further*, That in the expenditure of this fund for labor preference shall be given, other conditions being equal, to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, but any other preference or discrimination among citizens of the United States in connection with the expenditure of this appropriation is hereby declared to be unlawful.

"SEC. 7. That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized in his discretion to transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture all available war material, equipment, and supplies not needed for the purposes of the War Department, but suitable for use in the improvement of highways, and that the same be distributed among the highway departments of the several States to be used on roads constructed in whole or in part by Federal aid, such distribution to be made upon a value basis of distribution the same as provided by the Federal aid road act, approved July 11, 1916: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, at his discretion, may reserve from such distribution not to exceed 10 per cent of such material, equipment, and supplies for use in the construction of national forest roads or other roads constructed under his direct supervision.

"SEC. 8. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of \$3,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of \$3,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, the sum of \$3,000,000, available until expended by the Secretary of Agriculture in cooperation with the proper officials of the State, Territory, insular possession, or county, in the survey, construction, and maintenance of roads and trails within or partly within the national forests, when necessary for the use and development of resources of the same or desirable for the proper administration, protection, and improvement of any such forest. Out of the sums so appropriated the Secretary of Agriculture may, without the cooperation of such officials, survey, construct, and maintain any road or trail within a national forest which he finds necessary for the proper administration, protection, and improvement of such forest, or which in his opinion is of national importance. In the expenditure of this fund for labor preference shall be given, other conditions being equal, to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines.

"The Secretary of Agriculture shall make annual report to Congress of the amounts expended hereunder."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the language proposed by the Senate, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 9. That no officer or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps shall be detailed for work on the roads which come within the provisions of this act except by his own consent: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture through the War Department shall ascertain the number of days any such soldiers, sailors, and marines have worked on the

public roads in the several States (other than roads within the limits of cantonments or military reservations in the several States) during the existing war and also the location where they worked and their names and rank, and report to Congress at the beginning of its next regular session: *Provided further*, That when any officer or enlisted man in the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps shall have been or may be in the future detailed for labor in the building of roads or other highway construction or repair work (other than roads within the limits of cantonments or military reservations in the several States) during the existing war, the pay of such officer or enlisted man shall be equalized to conform to the compensation paid to civilian employees in the same or like employment and the amount found to be due such officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines, less the amount of his pay as such officer, soldier, sailor, or marine, shall be paid to him from the 1920 appropriation herein allotted to the States wherein such highway construction or repair work was or will be performed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN A. MOON,  
THOS. M. BELL,  
A. B. ROUSE,  
H. STEENERSON,  
MARTIN B. MADDEN,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

J. H. BANKHEAD,  
CLAUDE A. SWANSON,  
THOS. W. HARDWICK,  
CHAS. E. TOWNSEND,  
JOHN W. WEEKS,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreement of the House to the amendments of the Senate to H. R. 13308, entitled, "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees as to each of said amendments.

The Senate recedes from amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 39, 40, and 41. These amendments proposed to increase the compensation of supervisory officials in post offices of the first and second class, inspectors in the post-office inspection service, and assistant division superintendents in the Railway Mail Service, receiving salaries in excess of \$2,200 per annum, from an increase of 5 per cent, as proposed by the House, to approximately 10 per cent, as proposed by the amendments of the Senate.

The managers upon the part of the House agree to amendments numbered 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 42, and 43, which necessarily increases the amount of the appropriation for the payment of salaries to postal employees provided for in the various sections of the bill, because of the legislation contained in section 2, which extends the temporary increases, with slight modifications, hereinafter explained in connection with amendments 51 to 69, inclusive, provided for in the current fiscal year. The bill as it passed the House did not provide for the increased appropriations in the various sections of the bill necessary to carry out the provisions of section 2, except by general language making available the necessary funds without specifically stating the amount. The Senate, by its amendments in the various sections of the bill, made the necessary increases in the total amounts.

On amendment 8: Increases the compensation to postmasters at offices of the first, second, and third class from \$35,000,000 to \$36,500,000. This is necessary because of the legislation proposed by the House and concurred in by the Senate authorizing the Postmaster General to readjust the salaries of such postmasters, effective July 1, 1919, in accordance with the law regulating the salaries of postmasters prior to the war, except that in making such adjustment no allowance shall be made for the revenue derived from increased rates on first-class mail.

On amendment 9: Increasing the number of assistant postmasters from 50 to 60 at salaries not to exceed \$3,000 per annum becomes necessary because of the advance in salary of postmasters at first-class offices in consequence of the legislation authorizing the readjustment of the salaries of postmasters at offices of the first, second, and third class.

The managers upon the part of the House agree to amendment 22, providing for the promotion of 85 per cent of clerks in first and second class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade and the promotion of 15 per cent of sixth-grade clerks to special clerks in grades of \$1,300 and \$1,400 in view of section 2, which supersedes the act of March 2, 1907, classifying clerks and city letter carriers in first and second class



post offices, and restores automatic promotions. Under the reclassification act of July 2, 1918, clerks and carriers are automatically advanced \$100 per year to the sixth grade at a salary of \$1,500 per annum. The managers upon the part of the House agree to amendment 23 because the language stricken out is unnecessary in view of the reclassification act of July 2, 1918.

The managers on the part of the House agree to amendment 24 substituting the word "hereafter" for the word "thereafter" which was a clerical error in the print of the bill as it passed the House.

On amendment 25: Agreed to by the managers of the House, inserts the word "practicable" in the legislation proposed by the House requiring the employment of a substitute clerk if available rather than requiring a regular clerk to work overtime. The effect of the legislation as it passed the House, as pointed out by officials of the Post Office Department, would in many instances seriously interfere with prompt handling of the mails.

On amendment 30: Increases the amount for temporary and auxiliary clerk hire and for substitute clerk hire from \$5,000,000, as proposed in the amendment of the Senate, to \$6,000,000, which the Post Office Department insists will be necessary for the service during the next fiscal year. As it passed the House the appropriation was for \$6,500,000.

On amendment 36: As proposed by the Senate strikes out the House provision which diverted \$60,000 from the appropriation for vehicle allowance, etc., for the erection and equipment of a garage on a site owned by the Government adjoining the post-office building in the District of Columbia and inserted in lieu thereof an amendment authorizing the Postmaster General, in his discretion, to contract for pneumatic mail tube service upon such terms as may be agreed upon in the cities of New York and Brooklyn, and further provided that pending acting by Congress the properties of the pneumatic mail tube service within the basements and subbasements of post-office buildings in Philadelphia, Boston, New York, Brooklyn, Chicago, and St. Louis be not removed, but remain undisturbed without expense to the Government. The Senate recedes from its amendment respecting the pneumatic mail tube service and also the amendment striking out the provision for the construction of a garage. The bill as agreed upon contains no provision concerning pneumatic mail tube service.

On amendment 37: Relates to the compensation for the transportation of mail on Lake Winnepesaukee from the post office at Laconia, N. H., who furnishes his own equipment. This provision has been included in all recent appropriation bills. The unusual circumstances surrounding this contract, in the opinion of the conferees, justifies the legislation.

On amendment 38: Increases the amount that the Postmaster General may expend for Aeroplane Mail Service from \$300,000, as proposed by the House, to \$850,500, and the language proposed by the Senate lodges with him larger discretion respecting the character of equipment that he may purchase from either the War Department or the Navy Department for the service where such equipment is no longer necessary for war purposes. The language of the amendment, with certain modifications, agreed to by the House, directs the Postmaster General to purchase such supplies and equipment either from the War Department or Navy Department, if suitable for the Aeroplane Service, at a reasonable price, considering wear and tear and general condition; and in event purchase of equipment is made elsewhere, a report shall be submitted to Congress, together with the reasons for such purchases. Provision is made that separate accounts be kept of the amount expended for Aeroplane Mail Service. In the opinion of the managers of the House, the language of the Senate amendment is an improvement of the provisions of the House. The increased amount was shown to be necessary, in view of the fact that \$300,000 would not be sufficient to continue the experiment for Aeroplane Mail Service upon a basis that would demonstrate its usefulness in the Postal Service. With the sum of \$850,500 proposed the department explains that it will be enabled to establish one representative aeroplane mail route approximately 1,100 miles in length and provide the necessary equipment therefor. It was represented that any less sum would not be sufficient to insure a fair or thorough experiment.

On amendment 44: Agreed to by the House managers, increases from \$1.20 to \$2 per day the amount that may be allowed railway postal clerks assigned to duty in railway post-office cars while on duty for more than 10 hours from the time of beginning their initial run. The practice of the department is to divide the sum into four equal parts, allowing, under present law, 30 cents for each meal and 30 cents for a bed. The conferees are of the opinion that 30 cents for these items is not sufficient under present conditions. Under the law the clerk is entitled only to the amount expended by him, not to exceed 30 cents per item.

On amendment 45: Increases the appropriation for wrapping twine and tying devices from \$420,000 to \$560,000, which the

department insists is necessary to take care of the growth of the service.

On amendment 46: Increases the amount of \$1,500,000 proposed by the Senate to \$2,000,000, for the purchase, manufacture, and repair of mail bags, etc. As it passed the House, the appropriation was for \$2,435,000. The increased appropriation over the bill last year is necessary because of the growth of the service and the immense quantity of mail bags necessary for the over-seas mail service, where it is explained that large quantities of mail bags have been lost or used by the War Department for emergency military purposes.

On amendment 47: The increased appropriation is necessary to carry out the provisions of section 2, which increases the salaries of rural-delivery carriers 25 per cent in excess of their basic salary, which is an increase of 5 per cent over the increase proposed by the House.

On amendment 48: The language proposed by the Senate continues the allowance of \$24 per mile to rural carriers in each mile traveled in excess of 24 miles and increases for the fiscal year the compensation for motor-vehicle carriers who serve routes not less than 50 miles in length from \$2,160 per annum to \$2,250 per annum, an advance over the current temporary increase of 5 per cent.

On amendment 49: This amendment restores the provision of the House appropriating \$1,250,000 for village delivery service and also provides service in communities adjacent to cities having City Delivery Service.

On amendment 50: This amendment decreased from \$1,000,000, the amount provided for experimental motor-vehicle truck service, to \$300,000 and prescribes the conditions under which the experiments may be made which in the opinion of the conferees is necessary and essential to a determination of the wisdom of such service.

On amendments numbered 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, and 69: These amendments extend to employees in the Postal Service increased salary allowances because of the high cost of living throughout the country. As it passed the House the increased allowance was made permanent law. The Senate by its amendments limits the increases to the next fiscal year.

Section 2 of the bill as agreed to in conference in effect is the same as proposed by the House with the exception that it is temporary and increases the compensation for rural-delivery carriers and motor-route carriers, on routes in excess of 50 miles in length to 25 per cent in advance of their basic salaries, or 5 per cent in addition to the increases proposed by the House. Section 2 is further amended by a provision agreed to in conference as a substitute for an amendment proposed by the Senate, which provides that in offices of the first class no assistant postmaster or supervisory official shall receive a less salary than \$100 per annum in excess of the sixth grade salary provided for clerks and carriers in the City Delivery Service and in offices of the second class that assistant postmasters shall not be paid a less salary than that paid the highest-salaried clerk or letter carrier employed in such office.

Section 2 restores automatic promotions to clerks and carriers and railway postal clerks. The per cent increases for employees as provided in the current appropriation bill is continued for another year. The \$200 increase for assistant postmasters and supervisory officials whose salaries are less than \$2,200, as provided in the current bill, are continued, and the salaries of such employees in excess of \$2,200 are increased 5 per cent, the same as in the current law.

On amendment 70: The language of the Senate amendment contained in section 3, which creates a commission to investigate and readjust the salaries of postal employees, is accepted by the managers on the part of the House in lieu of the language as it passed the House.

On amendment 71: The managers upon the part of the House concur in the Senate provision which amends the definition of rural post roads on which Federal aid may be applied in their construction and maintenance and increases the limit of \$10,000 per mile, which may be expended, to \$20,000. Section 6 increases the appropriations available for Federal aid by \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921; and also provides that the amount allotted to the various States shall be held as a separate fund in the Treasury for future expenditure in such States where the fundamental law of the State prohibits appropriations for internal improvements until such States have amended the fundamental law so as to be able to participate in the funds provided. Provision is also made, other conditions being equal, that in the expenditure of the fund preference shall be given to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines.



Section 7 directs the Secretary of War in his discretion to transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture, for distribution among the several States upon the same basis of distribution as provided in the Federal aid act of all available war material, equipment, and supplies not needed for the purposes of the war.

Section 8 increases the appropriations for the construction of roads and trails within or partly within the national forests from \$1,000,000 per annum during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1919, 1920, and 1921, by \$3,000,000 per annum, and also contains a provision that preference shall be given in the employment of labor, other conditions being equal, to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines.

Section 9 prohibits the detail of any officer or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps in the construction or repair of roads that come within the provisions of the act except by his own consent, and further directs the Secretary of Agriculture to ascertain through the War Department the number of days and the location where such soldiers, sailors, and marines have worked on the public roads, other than those within the limits of cantonments or military reservations, and directs that in such cases their compensation shall be equalized to conform to that of civilian employees in similar employment, the amount found to be due to be deducted from the allotment in the 1920 appropriation to such State wherein the work was performed, less his compensation as such soldier or sailor, and paid to him from the allotment of such State wherein the work was done. The same provisions are made applicable to soldiers, sailors, and marines who may be in the future, during the existing war, detailed to work upon such roads.

On amendment 73: The House recedes, which is merely a correction in the number of the section.

JOHN A. MOON,  
THOS. M. BELL,  
A. B. ROUSE,  
H. STEENERSON,  
MARTIN B. MADDEN,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr Moon] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I think it hardly necessary to discuss this bill except in a very general way. You are familiar with the bill. The report is rather complete, and the statement of the House conferees is, I think, a fair statement of the effect of the provisions of the bill and of the Senate amendments.

Mr. Speaker, when the bill left the House it carried in round numbers \$357,000,000. However, the House must understand that that amount did not include the increase of salaries for clerks and carriers as provided in the bill. There was at the close of the bill a general provision that made the appropriation available for the payment of increase of personnel allowed in the bill for carriers and clerks as it had been in the previous bill.

The computation of that amount would have increased the figures of the bill as it left the House from three hundred and fifty-seven millions to three hundred and ninety eight millions in round numbers. So it is but fair to say that the bill as it reached the Senate carried nearly \$400,000,000.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. If I understand the gentleman's computation, the increase of salaries was about \$30,000,000?

Mr. MOON. Nearly forty million, taking all the increases.

Mr. GARNER. That is an increase in the present fiscal bill?

Mr. MOON. Yes. The Senate made seventy-odd amendments to this bill, but a great number of the amendments are due to the fact that they did not calculate the amount of the salaries upon the basic law, as the House had done, but it included the amount of the increase of salary. That accounts for a great many amendments that the Senate put on.

The Senate added various provisions to the bill. I do not deem it necessary to discuss all the items in the bill, but I will take up a few of the more important amendments.

We provided for the clerks and carriers, with their salaries and automatic promotion and permanent law. The Senate insisted that that should be a temporary provision and not permanent, by reason of the fact that both Houses, they said, had agreed to a commission for the purpose of adjusting and making salaries permanent and that all the other departments of the Government had made the salaries temporary. We felt that there was some force in the position under these circumstances, and therefore we yielded to the suggestion of the Senate that the salaries should be made for the fiscal

year ending June, 1920—making them temporary and not permanent.

On the question of rural carriers the Senate insisted on an increase in their pay. It was thought by the House conferees that that question ought also to abide the action of the commission, but so persistent was the Senate that in order to have an agreement on the matter at all the majority of the House conferees agreed to the increase in the pay of rural carriers to the amount of \$60 apiece per annum. That is also temporary.

A commission was provided for, to be appointed by the Vice President on the part of the Senate and by the Speaker on the part of the House, of five men from each body, to consider the question of salaries, the readjustment of salaries in the Postal Service, and the House accepted the language of the Senate amendment because it is broader and more comprehensive, I think, and more satisfactory than the language of the House.

On the question of motor trucks the House placed \$1,000,000 in the bill for the purpose of establishing motor-truck communication between the country and cities, particularly in that portion of the country where the rural routes were not paralleled by the railroads. It seems that the experiment heretofore made, or many experiments, were made along the lines of parallel railway and dirt roads. In the collection of the matter to be transported a large class of the first-class mail was diverted from the railroads to the trucks, and the trucks were given credit for it, and the space occupied by the Government on the railroads was not utilized for the purpose that it ought to have been.

In other words, the experiment was not just what it was intended to be. I may as well speak frankly about it, the Postmaster General did not desire, it appears from the hearings before the Senate committee, a larger sum than \$70,000 for the continuation of this experiment. The Fourth Assistant wanted the increase the House gave, \$1,000,000, for that purpose. After some difficulty the Senate, by a narrow vote, passed the proposition for \$300,000 to continue the experiment and provided lines along which the experiment should be made in rather a satisfactory way.

The House conferees thought it best to agree to the \$300,000 and waive the \$1,000,000 proposition as carried in the House bill.

On the aeroplane question there was practically a total change from the House provision. It was very clear that the number of machines which were authorized to be purchased by the House were not at all suitable to aeroplane service to the Post Office Department. It transpired that only a very few routes, one a long one, could be established and maintained under the appropriation of \$850,500 which was agreed to.

The House conferees thereupon adopted the Senate provision for the increase in the Aeroplane Service.

There was also in the Senate an amendment that provided for the use of pneumatic tubes for the department, a provision requiring that the tubes be left in the condition they were supposed to be in, in order that the Government might take up that service if it deemed it advisable hereafter. The House conferees felt that that question had been closed, and that the tubes as used heretofore were not of the character and type and value that they ought to be in carrying the mail; that they were only carrying 12 per cent of the letter mail in the tubes in great cities, and that if used at all they ought to be large enough to carry all the mails. So we resisted very strongly the reviving of the pneumatic-tube question at all, and upon that question the Senate yielded. Everything was stricken out of the bill in reference to the tubes.

The supervisory salaries provided for in the bill by the Senate amendments the House could not agree to, because they were largely the salaries of men already receiving the highest amount in salary, and we felt that if there was any change to be made in the salary of that class it ought to be in the salaries of those who were receiving less than \$2,200 instead of those who were receiving more. The Senate receded from its position on that question.

I believe that those are the more important features of the bill, except one exceedingly great and important amendment that was made by the Senate, in which the House concurred with some amendments. That is the appropriation of \$200,000,000 for good roads in the United States. The appropriation is in pursuance of the existing good-roads law. The amount appropriated is divided for use into three years, \$50,000,000 to be immediately available, \$75,000,000 available next year, and \$75,000,000 more available the next year, with the provision in the bill that preference shall be given to honorably discharged soldiers in the performance of the work.

A great deal of work has been done during the war on roads partly military and partly civil, if I may apply that term to



them, by soldiers and by civilians. By the side of the soldier, who was getting \$1 a day, worked the civilian at about \$4 a day or \$5 a day. We have provided that all of the soldiers of the United States who were detailed to that work and who performed it in part should be ascertained by the Secretary of Agriculture, and that the amount of the service that they rendered should be ascertained and that they should be paid the amount that the civilian employee received who worked by his side, and that the amount should be charged to the quota of the State where the work was done, because the road was built in that State and for the benefit of the State.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. That would not be retroactive for soldiers who have already rendered that work?

Mr. MOON. Oh, yes; it is required that in the use of the appropriation here, wherever a road has been built—that is, already built and the work was done by soldiers—that they shall have the pay that the civilians got who assisted in the work at the time, and it also provides for the future, that the soldiers shall have the preference in this work.

Mr. RAMSEYER. How did they happen to build roads purely for the benefit of the State, or does the benefit of the State come in only indirectly?

Mr. MOON. They did not build the roads purely for the benefit of the State. They built the roads primarily for military purposes, but they were along such lines of highway that they inured to the ultimate and final benefit of the State, and in most instances the State cooperated in the construction of those roads. It is in that class of work where a gang of white men and negroes worked for the State and were getting \$4.50 and \$5 a day for the work, while the soldier detailed by the Government to perform the Government part of the work or the military part of the work was given \$1 a day. We are providing that that soldier wherever he performed that work shall now have the same amount as the others received.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Were there any other roads built than roads connecting a town to a camp, over which to haul the supplies to the camps?

Mr. MOON. It appeared before us in the conference that at Camp Humphreys, in Virginia, there is a short road that was exclusively for military purposes, connecting the camp with the depot. That road is not of much benefit to the State of Virginia, but it was of great benefit to the United States at the time. It may not be of great benefit hereafter; but the fact remains that in the construction of that particular road, which perhaps is of less benefit to either State or Federal Government than any road we know of, the soldier worked for \$1 a day in making the road, while a civilian received three or four or five dollars a day. The soldier should have equal compensation with the civilian.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Who employed the civilian—the Army?

Mr. MOON. Yes; all of it was done under the Army, or co-operation between the Army and the State.

There is one other instance I know of where the Government of the United States is building to one of its cantonments a road 6 or 8 miles in length, where, by mutual consent, the county cooperated with the Government and paid one-half of the construction of the road. It is a very fine road; a concrete road about 60 feet wide. It was originally constructed, of course, by the county, but the Government had torn it to pieces and it was then repaired in that way.

Mr. RAMSEYER. How did they happen to mix the civilians and the soldiers—because they could not get enough civilian labor, or because they did not have enough soldiers?

Mr. MOON. They could not get enough civilian labor, and then the State could not employ the soldiers.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I thought the gentleman just stated that these roads were built under the supervision of the War Department.

Mr. MOON. All of the roads, of course, were built under the supervision of the War Department. The participation of these counties in the matter was simply for the furnishing of money for assistance, and in some instances that was not done at all. Of course, where the State has employed men and paid them we have nothing to do with it; but where we have employed soldiers, and that is the only point there is in the matter, to assist in the construction of a road, where the soldiers worked side by side with civilians, whether it was done by the joint action of the county and the State and the Government or done by the Government alone, the soldier was under the control and jurisdiction of his Government—was detailed for that work at \$1 a day—and we propose to give him for what he has done heretofore as much as the men that helped to do the work at his side received at the time. We think that is fair. We provide also in that bill that no soldier shall be detailed for work under the provisions of this act except by his own consent.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Just one other question. Does this also apply to soldiers who did road work overseas in France?

Mr. MOON. No. I do not know of that.

Mr. RAMSEYER. They did a lot of road work over there.

Mr. MOON. I know; but this applies to roads in the United States.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Were these roads of which the gentleman is speaking built strictly under appropriations of the Army, or were they built out of moneys that we provided several years ago in the regular governmental roads-building proposition?

Mr. MOON. They were supposed to be strictly military roads, although the county and the State participated with the Government in construction in some instances.

If they pay for it out of appropriations for military purposes it ought not to come out of this fund.

Mr. SNYDER. Out of the money provided for military purposes only the military must have employed the citizens who worked alongside of the soldiers.

Mr. MOON. I think in most instances they did.

Mr. SNYDER. How can you provide in this act to pay soldiers through the Army to bring them up to an equality with the civilians who are employed by the Army? I should think the Army would have to pay the soldiers out of their appropriations rather than for them to be paid out of this.

Mr. MOON. It is merely a correction of an act of injustice. It is a matter of bookkeeping, whether the War Department or the Agricultural Department should pay. If we put our soldiers by the side of other men who work on public works, whether we paid it or somebody else paid it, and the civilian employees were paid \$4 or \$5 a day, while the soldiers did not get but \$1, in our judgment the soldier ought to have the amount to make the pay equal to that of the civilian for the work they are performing of the same kind and character.

Mr. SNYDER. I quite agree with the gentleman, but is it not a fact in this case the civilian was employed in work alongside the soldier you just reverse what the gentleman says? Is it not a fact further that all these cantonment roads were built wholly by soldiers during all the period of the war, who were only paid \$1 a day?

Mr. MOON. Well, that may be true; I do not know how it was in all of them, but wherever the soldier did work and all were paid alike, \$1 a day, it was all right, I presume.

Mr. SNYDER. The only point I am making is that if there was a short spur road built outside of a cantonment upon which a body of civilians and soldiers were employed, I can not see any more reason why the soldier who did that work outside of the cantonment should get additional pay than the men who built the road inside. I think if one gets the additional pay they should all get it who were road builders.

Mr. MOON. I think inside of cantonments, having no one associated with him except fellow soldiers, and they are all doing work for the Government of the United States at a particular price of \$1 a day, neither one was prejudiced in the matter.

Mr. SNYDER. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. MOON. The gentleman can not ask questions and not give me time to answer them. While that condition existed there was nothing to complain about particularly, but the soldier can properly complain when his Government employs a gang of civilians at \$4 or \$5 a day and puts them to work and tells him to go to work on the same job and only pays him \$1 a day. I think he has a right to complain of that discrimination.

Mr. SNYDER. The point I am making is there is considerable complaint on the part of soldiers at least who build roads and other mechanical work inside of cantonments; there is a great deal of complaint on the part of those men. Now, you have provided that those who work with civilians outside shall have additional money and—

Mr. MOON. I have said to the gentleman there are very few instances of that kind I am informed. It is a very small amount involved so far as the provisions of that work are concerned.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. I will.

Mr. KING. In the case where soldiers at Camp MacArthur were put out to work on a county road, will it cover a case of that kind?

Mr. MOON. On a county road?

Mr. KING. Yes, sir; where their arms were taken away from them six weeks ago, and they were placed there upon a road to work. Would this cover that case?

Mr. MOON. Is the gentleman sure they were ever placed there?



Mr. KING. I do not know anything about it, but that is the information—

Mr. MOON. I do not know anything about it either; the gentlemen will have to get the construction of the department.

Mr. KING. I am asking the gentleman's construction of the law which he is preparing.

Mr. MOON. We can never construe the law in reference to a particular state of facts unless we can obtain the state of facts necessary to obtain an intelligent construction.

Mr. KING. If it was a fact, would it come under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. MOON. If what was a fact?

Mr. KING. If the soldiers at Camp MacArthur were placed at work upon a county road in the State of Texas before being discharged, would they receive the same pay as a civilian?

Mr. MOON. I should think they ought to receive full pay.

Mr. KING. Just one more question I would like to ask the gentleman. Under this provision, will soldiers at Newport News, working on the municipal water-works plant, receive the pay?

Mr. MOON. I do not think water works has anything to do with good roads.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I agree with the gentleman about paying soldiers the same amount as is paid to other employees, but as to charging it up to the States I do not exactly understand. For instance, in my State they have built a good many miles of road which will not be practically of any use after the close of the camp. Those are built 30 feet wide, whereas 16 feet would be all that would be necessary. Will that entire cost be charged up to our State whether the roads are of use to us or necessary; would they be charged up to our part of the fund?

Mr. MOON. I think it ought to be and is under this provision. You have the roads and ought to pay for them.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. I would like to get through with this, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KINCHELOE. This additional appropriation of \$200,000,000 for good roads—is that to be expended in the same way that the original good-roads law provides now; that is, with the cooperation of the States, dollar for dollar?

Mr. MOON. Exactly; wherever the State puts up money the Government puts up an equal amount, and it is on the basis of population, area, and roads. There is no change in the provisions of the original law at all.

Mr. KINCHELOE. It is just an increase in the amount of appropriation?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. MOON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SNYDER. If what the gentleman has just said, that this money is to be expended in the regular way, through the governmental road-building act, there can not be any of the money spent unless a State makes application for the expenditure of such money. Is that correct?

Mr. MOON. I take it so.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. Is it the expectation of the committee that any of this money can be used during the coming summer?

Mr. MOON. Fifty million dollars is appropriated for this present fiscal year.

Mr. SNELL. How much of the money that was appropriated under the other act is yet unexpended?

Mr. MOON. I do not know just what the amount is, but I will ask unanimous consent now as an extension of my remarks to place in the RECORD as Exhibit No. 1 a statement from the department as to the amount that will go to each State.

The matter referred to is as follows:

## EXHIBIT 1.

Apportionment of funds under Federal aid road act and under proposed amendment thereto.

States.	Amount available for fiscal years 1917, 1918, 1919.	\$50,000,000 proposed for fiscal year 1919.	Totals for fiscal year 1919.	Fiscal year 1920 allotment.	Fiscal year 1920 proposed \$75,000,000.	Fiscal year 1920 totals.	Fiscal year 1921 allotment.	Fiscal year 1921 proposed \$75,000,000.	Totals.	Total allotment now authorized.	Grand total.
Alabama.....	\$625,903.17	\$1,050,264.10	\$1,676,167.27	\$420,105.64	\$1,575,396.15	\$1,995,501.79	\$525,132.05	\$1,575,393.15	\$2,100,528.20	\$1,571,140.86	\$5,772,197.23
Arizona.....	411,081.14	685,043.57	1,096,124.71	274,017.43	1,027,565.36	1,301,582.79	342,521.79	1,027,565.36	1,370,087.15	1,027,620.36	3,767,794.65
Arkansas.....	495,085.77	840,229.53	1,335,315.30	336,091.81	1,260,344.30	1,595,436.11	420,114.76	1,260,344.30	1,680,459.06	1,254,292.34	4,615,210.47
California.....	900,358.99	1,524,248.30	2,423,607.29	609,609.32	2,286,372.45	2,896,071.77	762,124.15	2,286,372.45	3,048,496.60	2,281,182.46	8,378,175.63
Colorado.....	503,349.34	867,570.90	1,370,920.24	347,028.36	1,301,356.35	1,648,384.71	433,785.45	1,301,356.35	1,735,141.80	1,289,162.15	4,759,446.75
Connecticut.....	185,487.77	307,064.65	492,552.42	122,825.86	460,596.98	583,422.84	153,532.32	460,596.98	614,129.30	461,845.95	1,690,104.55
Delaware.....	45,965.10	81,384.45	130,349.55	32,553.78	122,076.68	154,630.46	40,692.22	122,076.68	162,768.90	122,211.10	447,748.91
Florida.....	338,652.69	573,797.20	912,449.89	229,518.88	860,695.80	1,090,214.68	285,898.60	860,695.80	1,147,594.40	855,070.17	3,150,258.97
Georgia.....	803,897.89	1,346,044.75	2,152,942.64	538,417.90	2,019,067.12	2,557,485.02	673,022.38	2,019,067.12	2,692,089.50	2,018,338.17	7,402,517.16
Idaho.....	363,862.05	610,509.27	974,371.32	244,203.71	915,763.91	1,159,967.62	305,254.64	915,763.91	1,221,018.55	913,320.40	3,355,357.49
Illinois.....	1,321,102.17	2,185,550.65	3,506,652.82	874,220.26	3,278,325.97	4,152,546.23	1,092,775.32	3,278,325.97	4,371,101.29	3,288,097.75	12,030,300.34
Indiana.....	813,473.04	1,349,919.40	2,163,392.44	539,967.76	2,024,879.10	2,564,846.86	674,959.70	2,024,879.10	2,699,838.80	2,028,400.50	7,428,078.10
Iowa.....	873,180.41	1,443,046.20	2,316,226.61	577,218.48	2,164,569.30	2,741,787.78	721,523.10	2,164,569.30	2,886,092.40	2,171,921.99	7,944,108.79
Kansas.....	853,754.08	1,436,313.93	2,292,068.01	574,525.57	2,154,470.89	2,728,996.46	718,156.96	2,154,470.89	2,872,627.85	2,151,436.61	7,896,092.32
Kentucky.....	585,400.35	976,805.17	1,562,265.52	390,746.07	1,465,297.76	1,856,043.83	483,432.59	1,465,297.76	1,953,730.35	1,464,579.01	5,372,039.70
Louisiana.....	403,179.27	680,729.03	1,086,908.30	272,291.61	1,021,093.55	1,293,385.16	340,361.51	1,021,093.55	1,361,458.06	1,018,835.39	3,741,751.52
Maine.....	290,161.92	481,231.35	771,333.47	192,492.62	721,847.33	914,339.95	240,615.78	721,847.33	962,463.11	723,270.32	2,645,196.53
Maryland.....	263,013.09	434,737.02	697,750.11	173,894.81	652,105.53	826,000.34	217,398.31	652,105.53	869,474.04	654,276.41	2,393,221.49
Massachusetts.....	442,814.70	736,833.30	1,179,698.00	294,753.32	1,105,324.95	1,400,078.27	368,441.65	1,105,324.95	1,473,766.60	1,106,009.67	4,053,542.87
Michigan.....	872,707.53	1,447,213.80	2,319,921.33	578,885.52	2,170,820.70	2,749,703.22	723,006.90	2,170,820.70	2,894,427.60	2,175,199.95	7,964,055.15
Minnesota.....	853,017.58	1,420,774.53	2,273,822.11	568,309.81	2,131,161.80	2,699,471.61	710,387.26	2,131,161.80	2,841,549.06	2,131,744.65	7,814,642.78
Mississippi.....	535,469.12	899,488.26	1,434,957.38	359,795.31	1,240,325.39	1,709,027.70	449,744.14	1,240,325.39	1,789,076.53	1,345,003.57	4,942,961.61
Missouri.....	1,017,765.21	1,695,314.11	2,713,079.32	678,125.64	2,542,971.14	3,231,096.78	847,657.05	2,542,971.14	3,390,623.19	2,542,971.90	9,420,621.29
Montana.....	503,382.46	990,467.15	1,592,847.61	399,786.86	1,499,200.33	1,898,987.59	499,733.58	1,499,200.33	1,998,934.31	1,492,902.93	5,490,771.51
Nebraska.....	639,757.68	1,066,642.07	1,706,399.75	426,056.83	1,599,963.10	2,025,619.93	533,321.01	1,599,963.10	2,133,284.14	1,592,735.55	5,896,303.82
Nevada.....	386,424.72	642,933.45	1,029,358.17	257,173.38	964,400.18	1,221,573.56	321,466.72	964,400.18	1,285,866.90	965,034.82	3,536,793.63
New Hampshire.....	125,599.97	207,810.38	333,410.35	83,124.15	311,715.57	394,839.72	103,905.19	311,715.57	415,620.76	312,629.31	1,143,870.83
New Jersey.....	353,995.26	594,050.80	949,046.06	237,620.32	891,076.20	1,123,696.52	297,025.40	891,076.20	1,188,101.60	889,640.93	3,265,844.18
New Mexico.....	474,847.98	793,785.78	1,273,633.76	319,514.31	1,198,178.67	1,517,692.93	399,392.89	1,198,178.67	1,597,571.56	1,193,755.18	4,388,893.30
New York.....	1,501,835.01	2,487,966.40	3,989,791.41	995,182.56	3,731,934.00	4,727,117.16	1,243,978.20	3,731,934.00	4,975,912.80	3,740,995.77	13,692,821.37
North Carolina.....	685,702.23	1,139,977.47	1,825,679.70	455,999.99	1,709,966.20	2,165,957.19	569,988.74	1,709,966.20	2,279,954.94	1,711,681.96	6,271,581.93
North Dakota.....	458,015.09	768,360.27	1,226,375.37	307,344.11	1,152,540.42	1,459,884.53	384,180.14	1,152,540.42	1,539,720.56	1,149,539.34	4,222,980.46
Ohio.....	1,118,759.68	1,854,462.47	2,973,222.15	741,784.99	2,781,693.71	3,523,478.70	927,231.24	2,781,693.71	3,708,924.95	2,787,775.91	10,205,625.80
Oklahoma.....	691,906.34	1,133,055.50	1,844,961.84	461,222.20	1,729,583.25	2,190,805.45	576,527.75	1,729,583.25	2,306,111.00	1,729,655.29	6,341,878.23
Oregon.....	472,394.85	787,459.10	1,259,853.95	314,983.64	1,181,188.65	1,496,172.29	393,723.55	1,181,188.65	1,574,918.20	1,181,108.04	4,330,944.44
Pennsylvania.....	1,382,078.29	2,296,075.55	3,678,154.14	918,430.34	3,444,113.77	4,362,544.11	1,148,037.92	3,444,113.77	4,592,151.69	3,448,546.55	12,632,819.94
Rhode Island.....	69,969.51	116,530.95	186,500.46	46,612.35	174,796.43	221,408.81	58,265.48	174,796.43	233,061.91	174,847.37	640,971.18
South Carolina.....	430,437.00	717,297.05	1,147,734.05	288,918.82	1,075,945.58	1,362,864.40	358,645.52	1,075,945.58	1,434,594.10	1,076,004.34	3,945,192.55
South Dakota.....	486,013.67	810,720.68	1,296,734.35	324,288.27	1,216,081.02	1,540,369.29	405,360.34	1,216,081.02	1,621,441.36	1,215,662.28	4,458,545.00
Tennessee.....	683,123.95	1,132,103.50	1,815,227.45	452,841.40	1,698,155.25	2,150,993.65	568,051.75	1,698,155.25	2,264,207.00	1,702,017.10	6,230,431.10
Texas.....	1,752,770.13	2,967,219.37	4,678,989.50	1,170,487.75	4,389,329.05	5,559,816.80	1,463,109.69	4,389,329.05	5,852,438.74	4,388,367.57	16,091,245.04
Utah.....	341,613.62	567,592.10	909,205.72	227,036.84	851,388.15	1,078,424.99	283,796.05	851,388.15	1,135,184.20	892,445.51	3,122,814.91
Vermont.....	135,622.33	225,987.70	362,050.03	90,395.08	338,981.55	427,376.63	112,993.85	338,981.55	451,975.42	345,001.26	1,244,022.03
Virginia.....	597,102.90	992,052.95	1,589,155.85	396,821.18	1,488,079.43	1,884,900.61	495,025.48	1,488,079.43	1,984,105.91	1,489,950.56	5,458,162.37
Washington.....	432,183.03	722,367.25	1,154,555.28	288,946.90	1,083,550.87	1,372,497.77	361,183.62	1,083,550.87	1,444,734.49	1,154,331.55	3,971,782.54
West Virginia.....	319,525.27	532,003.10	851,534.37	212,803.64	798,013.65	1,010,817.29	266,004.55	798,013.65	1,064,018.20	798,333.45	2,926,399.83
Wisconsin.....	767,790.41	1,272,945.53	2,040,736.94	500,178.61	1,909,419.79	2,418,598.40	635,473.26	1,909,419.79	2,545,833.05	1,913,442.28	7,005,228.33
Wyoming.....	367,898.24	612,912.45	980,308.69	245,164.98	919,368.68	1,164,333.66	303,456.22	919,368.68	1,225,824.90	919,017.44	3,370,667.25
Total.....	29,100,000.00	48,500,000.00	77,600,000.00	19,400,000.00	72,750,000.00	92,150,000.00	24,250,000.00	72,750,000.00	97,000,000.00	72,750,000.00	268,750,000.00
Administration.....	900,000.00	1,500,000.00	2,400,000.00	600,000.00	2,250,000.00	2,850,000.00	750,000.00	2,250,000.00	3,000,000.00	2,250,000.00	8,250,000.00
Grand total.....	30,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	80,000,000.00	20,000,000.00	75,000,000.00	95,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	75,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	75,000,000.00	275,000,000.00



Mr. SNELL. Is it not a fact that none of that money has been expended yet?

Mr. MOON. I do not know. I will say to the House that this is a rider on the Post Office bill and that this question will be better answered by the chairman of the Committee on Roads. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has no jurisdiction of the same as an original question. We have obtained jurisdiction by reason of its being a Senate rider. But I can later give the gentleman the information. The report is not before me.

Mr. SNELL. I appreciate that fact; but it was brought into the House on your appropriation bill, and under the condition of the finances of the Government I think we should have some definite information before we add an appropriation like that on any appropriation bill—that calls for an expenditure of \$200,000,000.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I think I can answer that question in part. I understand that there is about \$50,000,000 available of antecedent appropriations.

Mr. MOON. I will say that there is a statement about it in the report.

Mr. SNELL. As given out by the Labor Committee, only \$4,000,000 of that money has been expended.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman that it is larger than I thought it was. The amount to be available from antecedent balances is larger than I thought. The balances available from former and present fiscal years, due to interruption of war, from Federal and State sources, is about \$70,000,000.

Mr. MOON. That is from the paper that we will put in the Record. You will all have it before you.

Mr. SNELL. It ought to be before the House. It is a question of whether or not we ought to put it on the people. I think it is important to know whether we will be able to spend the money during the coming season.

Mr. MOON. I am sure you will spend all the money you want to on this or anything else that you get it for.

Mr. SNELL. There are certain conditions to be met before we can spend the money. We must lay out roads, and, as I understand it, many of the States have never made a provision for spending this money, and we should have that information before the House.

Mr. BROWNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. I yield.

Mr. BROWNE. I asked the Secretary of Agriculture the other day under whom the road funds are expended. He informed me there were over 7,000 miles of roads built under the last appropriation.

Mr. SNELL. Do you mean that there have been 7,000 miles of roads built under that appropriation?

Mr. BROWNE. Seven thousand miles of road built under the Federal aid act with the amount that different States contributed toward it.

Mr. SNELL. Do you mean built or just provided for? Do you mean they were just surveyed?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to these gentlemen to have a debate?

Mr. MOON. No, sir; but I will let them run for about a minute.

Mr. BROWNE. I was going to state to the gentleman that over \$25,000,000 has been expended in the last Federal road act of \$75,000,000.

Mr. MOON. Now, Mr. Speaker, may I observe here that I most heartily approve of this appropriation of \$200,000,000. And I do not appreciate very much any captious criticism. I know we are very largely involved in the war debt. We have spent millions of dollars for armament and for all the purposes and paraphernalia of war. I know of necessity that in the conduct of a great war like this, both at home and abroad, there must have been very much money improperly spent, whether corruptly spent or not, of course we could not know. I know that some of this work you speak of may have been unnecessary. But those things are behind us now. The \$200,000,000 of money we used we have to meet and pay. That being true, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how this is to be done except by taxes from the people. Of course, you appreciate the fact, and I do, too, that this Government can be and ought to be run for less than one-half of the amount that is expended in its administration, even when we wipe away these war boards and all the instrumentalities in a clerical way for war purposes here. We ought to destroy more than two-thirds of these commissions that are in operation to-day under the Government. We ought to consolidate departments.

It may be we ought to consolidate even Cabinet positions in the interest of economy. We ought to ultimately reduce salaries.

We ought to take the necessary steps for that purpose. We ought to realize that in this Government we have to tax the people and issue bonds to pay the amount of this debt. Only the interest can be paid now. To undertake to levy taxes to pay the principal would be practical confiscation of the people's property. Then let us have as simple a Government as we can, and do away with all the boards that we can dispense with, and all the salaries that we can dispense with, and greatly reduce the Army, put it at the minimum figure, and bring our Government down to the lowest possible figure at which it can be administered economically. And then what comes? There still remains an immense debt that must be paid; and if you pay it, gentlemen, you have got to repeal, and repeal, and still further repeal, numbers of laws that you have enacted here, not only on the pretext and for the purposes of war, but laws which you enacted before this war began, restricting the commerce, the business interests, of the country.

You have to deal with these economic propositions now, because you are passing from a position of war into a position of peace. In addition, a reconstruction is upon us, under which you can not get your revenue unless you increase your business and commerce and foster and encourage all the material interests of this country. You can not do that unless you take the steps necessary to expand your commerce, your business interests, agriculture, mining, and manufacturing in the United States.

Therefore one of the greatest propositions, I think, involved in the whole question is not a recession from public economies, but an advance movement along that line, and there is no better one than a good-roads proposition, and that ought to come at the very hour and minute of the reconstruction of the business interests of the United States that must follow this war. Unless you develop and our people prosper, you can not get taxes to pay public debts.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman to say that this bill as it left the House carried appropriations and authorizations to the amount of about \$400,000,000?

Mr. MOON. Yes. The reason it showed on its face \$360,000,000 I believe I stated.

Mr. MANN. How much does the gentleman figure the bill as reported from the conference committee will carry in appropriations and authorizations?

Mr. MOON. It will carry a fraction over \$600,000,000, in my judgment. The exact figures have not been made, but it will carry something over \$600,000,000.

Mr. MANN. So that in conference it has been increased over 50 per cent?

Mr. MOON. I thought the gentleman understood the reason why the figures of the House were different. It was this: When we were in the House we calculated everything on the old law of salary, which made about \$358,000,000 or \$359,000,000. But we made provisions in the act which we did not compute, as you know, in the bill. We provided for increases which, if they had been computed in dollars and cents, would have amounted to about \$400,000,000.

Mr. MANN. Four hundred million dollars in the House increased to over \$600,000,000 is an increase of 50 per cent.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman is correct in the fact that this appropriation for good roads increases it \$200,000,000, which is a third of the total of the \$600,000,000.

Now, I was about to observe before yielding to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Speaker, that in the condition in which we find our fiscal affairs we ought to do all we can to encourage the business interests of the country. To expand is necessary to secure prosperity, and prosperity alone produces large taxes. Taxes of all kinds must be reduced. You can not have people engaged in manufacturing and agricultural and mining industries in this country for profit if you are going to take every dollar of that profit and put it into the Federal Treasury. You have to give encouragement to them if you want to get the revenues sufficient to pay this debt not only by a reduction of national governmental expenses, but you have to give a reduction in taxation against the citizen. If you do not you break him down and make it impossible for him to raise the revenue to pay your debt. And you have to quit your disputes about tariff and lay any tariff tax that will produce revenue, but never so high as to create monopoly and trusts nor so low as to destroy industries and reduce labor to low conditions. Let us come to the consideration of these questions which will encourage, upbuild, and foster all of the material interests of our country in order that you may get the revenue to meet your debt. In other words, you have to have an enlarged United States commercially in all its business lines to



meet these great obligations, with the removal of all improper restrictions on the people. Good roads will do more than all other things to bring unbounded prosperity to our country.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. I would like to inquire if it is the purpose of the gentleman to give some time to others? He has now occupied 45 minutes of the hour.

Mr. MOON. We have got more than an hour if we want it. I have occupied that time largely in answering questions, which I thought altogether proper. I am going to yield to the distinguished gentleman later. I yield 10 minutes now to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. STEENERSON. I had supposed I would control the time on this side, and it was my purpose to yield to the gentleman from Illinois; but if the gentleman from Tennessee proposes to yield to him, all right.

Mr. MOON. I had an hour, and I used 40 minutes of it, and I have a right to do anything I want with the balance of it. I will give the gentleman from Minnesota some and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] some time, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE] some, and then I am going to save enough of the hour to move the previous question.

Mr. STEENERSON. Does the gentleman intend to give me some time?

Mr. MOON. I said I would if you wanted it; yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. How much time does the gentleman desire? Have I only an hour, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. That is all.

Mr. MOON. How much does the gentleman from Illinois desire?

Mr. MADDEN. Ten minutes.

Mr. MOON. How much does the gentleman from Minnesota want?

Mr. STEENERSON. I want some time when the gentleman gets through. I have two or three applications for time.

Mr. MOON. I want to be frank with the gentleman, and—

Mr. STEENERSON. I thought we could make some arrangements in advance, so that I would know what my rights are.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman ought to know what his rights are under the rule. I have the hour. Under that I can move the previous question.

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not care.

Mr. MOON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Minnesota may have all the time he wants. I will give the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] 10 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE] 5 minutes, and that will leave me 5 minutes. Then I will ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota can have what time he wants.

Mr. MANN. Let the gentleman from Minnesota be recognized.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman from Illinois knows that unless we have some agreement I will lose the floor.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. The gentleman can take the floor and move the previous question.

Mr. MOON. How much does the gentleman desire?

Mr. STEENERSON. I think I will require about half an hour.

Mr. MOON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that that time be given the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. I would like to have a little time, if I may be permitted to take it. I have just come in from my committee room, where I have been trying to assist in preparing another enormous deficiency bill. I have not had time, as one Member of the House, to read the conference report. I have been able only to go through it hop, skip, and jump. There ought to be four or five hours' debate on this proposition, so that we may understand it.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, including the 40 minutes I have occupied, there shall be two hours' debate upon this question, 20 minutes of that time to be controlled by myself and an hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON]. That would be 1 hour and 20 minutes more in all.

The SPEAKER. The Chair could not hear the gentleman.

Mr. MOON. I said I would ask unanimous consent that 1 hour and 20 minutes more time should be given to this debate, making 2 hours in all, 20 minutes to be controlled by myself and 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman want that 1 hour and 20 minutes to be added to what the gentleman has already used?

Mr. MOON. Yes. That makes two hours in all.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the time be extended one hour, which will leave 20 minutes to be controlled by him and will give the

gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. And that at the end of that time the previous question be considered as ordered.

Mr. MOON. And that at the end of that time the previous question be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. And at the end of that time the previous question be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOON. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] desire to proceed now?

Mr. STEENERSON. No. It was my intention to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] five minutes.

Mr. MOON. And I yield him 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. For four years now I have been working as strenuously as I knew how in an effort to get legislation which I consider of great importance and quite essential to the future welfare of the Post Office Department. That legislation consisted in arranging an automatic scale of promotion, giving higher standards of compensation to the carriers and clerks, and to the railway mail clerks. The House with full knowledge of the facts voted substantially unanimously for the enactment of a permanent law giving clerks and carriers a new status. Unfortunately, when the bill went over to the Senate, that body decided to make the law temporary, and while the conferees of the House sat for several days, insisting very strenuously upon the House provision of the bill, we were compelled ultimately to yield to the pressure of the Senate, because we did not want to take the responsibility of the Senate defeating the legislation for all other branches of the Postal Service.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I want to say to the gentleman that I think he is to be congratulated upon his success in securing an increase of payments to postal employees of about \$40,000,000, as I gather from the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon], because according to the best information I can get about \$5,000,000 of that will go to Chicago, and the Chicago people ought to pass resolutions very complimentary to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I am very much obliged to the gentleman from Texas, but I think he does not quite comprehend the facts in the case. Unfortunately, Chicago will get a very small portion of this, although I would be glad to see them get a large portion; but I have not been working on this legislation with any idea of promoting the welfare of Chicago. My work is intended to promote the success of the Postal Service all over the United States, and I think experience shows that because of a lack of proper compensation for men engaged in this important service the service has run down materially in all the great centers of the country. These men were permitted to enter the service on a basic salary of only \$800, and it took them five years to get up to the basic salary of \$1,200, and you can not get men of the type required in the service to work for that compensation. My thought was that the increased compensation provided for in the bill as reported back from the conferees—namely, a minimum of \$1,000 and a maximum of \$1,500—is not a war-time compensation at all but a peace-time compensation, only adequate for the important duties these men are called upon to perform. The same thing is true with respect to the rural carriers. I was anxious to see their increase made permanent. I was anxious to see the increase of the rural carriers combined with the increase of the city carriers and the clerks and made permanent law. It ought to have been made permanent law without any question; but the Senate did not agree with us. I am proud that every conferee appointed by the House stood like a stone wall in favor of the permanency of this legislation in all its aspects, and yielded only because they did not want to assume the responsibility of defeating the legislation entirely. But provision has been made by the conferees for the appointment of a commission to consider the whole question of salaries in the Postal Service; and I assume this commission will be appointed before the adjournment of this Congress, and it will probably be engaged in the work of investigating and adjusting salaries all during the coming summer. I am quite certain that no salary will be reduced, but, if anything, salaries will be increased above what we provide in this bill. The Postmaster General already, in a communication to the conferees, says that the supervisory officials of the Post Office Department are not getting sufficient compensation, and that increases ought to be made along the



line among those supervisory officials. Now, the supervisory officials are the high-paid men in the department, and while I recognize the ability of these men, they are already getting a good deal more than the men whose compensation is provided for in this act. They are entitled to more than they are getting, because some of these men are very able, and if they were employed in commercial life they would receive a good deal more compensation than the Government pays them.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. What provision does this bill make, if any, for an increase in the pay of the fourth-class postmasters?

Mr. MADDEN. The basic law provided for the payment to fourth-class postmasters of the first \$50 cancellations quarterly. Last year we make it \$80 quarterly. This bill provides for \$100 quarterly, so that is quite an increase.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Twenty dollars.

Mr. MADDEN. Twenty dollars a quarter, or four times twenty, or \$80, a year.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Twenty dollars a quarter over what their pay was last year?

Mr. MADDEN. Twenty dollars a quarter increase; yes. So the fourth-class postmasters have been provided for in this bill very generously. Yet there are over 10,000 fourth-class postmasters in the United States whose compensation is less than \$50 a quarter, and perhaps this is very much less than it ought to be. There ought to be some readjustment of that, and doubtless there will be when this commission gets to work and knows the facts in the case. Then there are other men whose compensation as fourth-class postmasters almost reach the line of third-class postmaster compensation, and there it turns out that they have a good deal of expense in connection with the work. The work is voluminous and perhaps we do not pay them what we ought to pay.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Can the gentleman tell us what provision was made in the line of clerk hire for the third-class offices?

Mr. MADDEN. The clerk hire for third-class offices has always been paid out of a lump-sum provision allotted to the Postmaster General and distributed to the third-class postmasters, the minimum for the lowest third-class postmaster being \$300 per annum. It went up to \$400, \$600, and \$800. Now we make the \$300 \$450, the \$400 \$600, and the \$600 \$900, and the \$800 \$1,200, making an increase of 50 per cent over what they received before.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Has there been any increase in the amount allowed the fourth-class postmaster for fuel, light, and so forth?

Mr. MADDEN. No; that has never been done, and there is no change in that respect.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McKENZIE. The allowance paid to the third-class postmasters for clerk hire is a fund he can expend in any way he may deem best?

Mr. MADDEN. He can expend the allotment accorded to him by the Postmaster General in such manner as the best interests of the service require, and he is the judge of that.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. With certain limitations.

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. McKENZIE. If he has a \$900 allowance and he can hire a clerk for \$600—

Mr. MADDEN. He can not take any part of the \$900 himself. Oh, no; it must be paid to the clerk. The postmaster is not permitted to take any part of it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is there any provision in the bill that limits the employment of a janitor to any post office not canceling a certain amount of stamps?

Mr. MADDEN. There is no provision to limit the amount of work any man may do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I understood that there would be no janitor at any office where the receipts were less than \$20,000.

Mr. MADDEN. There is no such provision in the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have not been in the House all the morning. Has the gentleman reached the subject of the rural carriers?

Mr. MADDEN. I have, but I shall be glad to answer any question the gentleman may wish to ask.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. What arrangement was made about the rural carriers?

Mr. MADDEN. The rural carrier section provides for pay for each mile over 24 miles, and the extra mileage pay is made permanent, and in addition to that the compensation of the rural carrier is increased 25 per cent.

Now, I wish to call the attention of the House to the road question. We are in a period of transition that requires preparation for the employment of men who are coming back from the front. If there ever was a time when every public institution in the land, county, State, and Nation, should make provision for more opportunities for employment, this is the time. Everybody seems to be fearful about entering upon new enterprises. Labor conditions are in a state of uncertainty. Nobody knows what the wage scale is to be. The price of materials fluctuates; it may go up and it may go down, and no man in the United States cares to enter upon a new undertaking. That creates a state of doubt in the public mind. That state of doubt will undoubtedly create a state of stagnation if it is continued far enough.

Then the duty of the public functionaries is clear, and that duty in my judgment calls for provision, calls for action, so that employment of some kind out of the funds of the public Treasury may be used to advance the interests of different sections of the Nation.

Although we are in debt, and we have created obligations due to the war that are onerous and gigantic, we still owe an obligation to the country to dissipate the state of doubt that is being created by the refusal of private individuals, companies, and corporations to enter upon new adventures, so to speak. For every man we employ by the creation of new works in the State, county, and Nation will tend to encourage private employers to enter upon new work, and when we encourage that I think we have done a patriotic duty.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. FESS. How soon could this work be begun?

Mr. MADDEN. I anticipate that a great many of the States have already made provision. Take, for example, the State of Illinois. The people there have already voted \$60,000,000 in bonds to construct new highways. Fifteen millions of that \$60,000,000 will be available as early as April of this year. Fifty millions of the \$200,000,000 in this bill is available for distribution during the fiscal year of 1919. That means between now and the 1st of July. The State of Illinois undoubtedly would get its proportion. The State of New York, I understand, already has in contemplation the construction of a large mileage of roads, and there is provision in this bill for allotments to States like New York through the increase of the limitation of the cost per mile. For example, the basic law provided that no allotments could be made to any State where the cost per mile of the road was more than \$10,000. That, of course, would cut out of the allotments from these appropriations States like New York and perhaps Ohio and Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, may I have two or three minutes more?

Mr. STEENERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. We now fix the limit at \$20,000 a mile, because the character of road being constructed by those States costs that much, and so we open the doors to the participation by these States in the benefits to be derived from the immediate use of money which will give employment to men already out of work.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The work here contemplated does not necessarily compete with private enterprise, because it is not likely that private enterprise will do such work.

Mr. MADDEN. The only thing it does is this: We do not compete with private enterprise, but we find employment, which private enterprise will not take the risk to find. Finding the employment, we encourage the purchase of new supplies and the opening of new avenues of employment, and thereby we begin to create the confidence which is necessary to maintain the equilibrium of proper business conditions.



Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, we all understand that the gentleman from Illinois speaks always to the fact, and I desire to get his judgment upon the question of unemployment. Will the gentleman state whether he thinks there will be a great deal of unemployment if public enterprises are not entered upon?

Mr. MADDEN. I am afraid there will be; it looks that way now. Let me take, for example, the case of a young man who has just returned from France, who held a high rank in the Army—a genius in his own line. He took several days to investigate conditions which would confront him upon his return, and he reported back to me, after he had given two weeks of careful study to the question, that every man with whom he came in contact was afraid of the labor conditions, the uncertainty, afraid of the fluctuating costs of supplies, afraid of the conditions that abound in the country, and they all said that they were going to hold back and would not enter upon any new enterprise, and he himself, anxious to enter upon new enterprises, said that he would wait for the next six months or a year to see what would happen. If that feeling is general throughout the country, and I think it is, then our duty is clear, and we are performing a patriotic function when we participate with the States in the development of public enterprise.

Mr. FESS. Does this appropriation contemplate cooperation with the States?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes; it is only used for that purpose and nothing else.

Mr. HASTINGS. Would the gentleman permit me to state that Oklahoma will also ally herself with States like Illinois and New York in this good-road movement? Already the State of Oklahoma is considering the issue of \$50,000,000 of bonds for good-road work.

Mr. MADDEN. I think all of the States are alive to the necessities of the case, and I am very glad they are. I have advised it everywhere, and I think now, above all times, is the time for municipalities and counties and States to take the lead, and if Federal cooperation can be had in connection with their activities so much the better. [Applause.]

By unanimous consent Mr. MADDEN was granted leave to extend and revise his remarks in the Record.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Browne].

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, the last Federal highway law passed July 11, 1916, provided for an appropriation of \$75,000,000 for highways, besides \$10,000,000 for highways through the national parks. The question was asked here in regard to the amount that had already been expended. I have a letter here from the Secretary of Agriculture or from the Director of Roads in that department, and he says that all except \$25,000,000 has been apportioned among the several States.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. How much of that has been actually expended up to the present time? I ask the gentleman to please answer that question for the information of the House.

Mr. BROWNE. I shall do so before I get through with my remarks. In the State of Wisconsin I know that we have expended quite a good portion of the share apportioned to us. Of course, road work, as all other work, has been held up on account of the war, but the gentleman can not find any great fault because all of this money has not been expended. It is there; it has not been wasted. The argument was originally advanced that the money would be wasted, and a good many were skeptical about Federal aid when we passed the Federal aid act, but to-day every highway commission in the United States, and there are 48 of them, is heartily in favor of Federal aid for roads. It has stimulated road building more than anything else in the last 100 years. To-day there are over 7,000 miles of road projects that have been examined and approved by the Federal Government, and the machinery is all ready. Almost every State in the Union is ready to begin work on its system of roads and pay one-half the cost of the roads as soon as this appropriation is available. Some of these roads have not only been surveyed, but they have been graded, and the preliminary work has been done.

I want to say a word in regard to the labor question involved here, the question of unemployment. We know there will be millions of men out of employment when war industries and the Army are demobilized. Various public works have been suggested to give employment to these men, but I think none of them is as practical as road work. In the first place, every one of the 48 States has to put in at least dollar for dollar for the aid given by the Federal Government in this work. This will be a check on extravagance. So far the States have put in more than the Federal Government has; they have put in more than dollar for dollar, and with the road ma-

chinery all ready, with the State highway organizations all ready in these 48 States, without any delay whatever they can take the surplus labor and put it to work on the roads. Road work furnishes employment not only for skilled labor—civil engineers and skilled mechanics—but also for common, everyday labor.

And there is no kind of work that will furnish such a diversity of labor as road work. The work is out of doors; it is healthful employment; and, as I say, for every dollar expended by the Federal Government the State has to put in a dollar beside it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE. I will.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I understand the reward we are going to give these boys for fighting is to give them a job with a pick and shovel when they come back.

Mr. BROWNE. If they want it. They need not accept it; but a million of men will be out of employment who are now engaged in the war industries, and while they are demobilizing and readjusting themselves we can use these men upon the roads.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE. I will.

Mr. SNYDER. If the gentleman has had any experience in road building, I would like to ask the type of men in the State of Wisconsin who go to work on the highways? Does the gentleman think a very large percentage of the men coming back from the war will be applicants for a position with pick and shovel?

Mr. BROWNE. I think they will be.

Mr. SNYDER. I think the gentleman is highly mistaken.

Mr. BROWNE. There will be civil engineers—

Mr. SNYDER. A very small per cent.

Mr. BROWNE. And there will be laborers; there will be all kinds of laborers. I know men to-day just out of the Army who have gone out to work as civil engineers and in other capacities in different States on the roads—

Mr. SNYDER. This, then, is a proposition to provide civil engineers with jobs?

Mr. BROWNE. I have simply taken civil engineers as an example.

Mr. SNYDER. I have not any doubt it looks good to them.

Mr. BROWNE. We have seen right down here in the South—it has been brought up here to-day—that men were getting \$4 and \$5 a day for working on roads.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman, in my judgment, is hitting the right point.

Mr. BROWNE. Right down here our soldiers were asked to be given the same amount, and they have been given the same amount for working on the roads, and I think with the wages which the different States and localities can furnish there will be thousands and thousands of workmen who will be very glad to work on the roads in that out-of-door employment. It is not all with a pick. There are different kinds of work and different kinds of skill used in road work. Now, another thing. The appropriation passed by the Sixty-fourth Congress for Federal aid, July 11, 1916, was the first appropriation made by the Federal Government for over 100 years. Our city friends objected to it because the Federal aid did not extend to the cities. This is a rural highway proposition. There does not a dollar of it go into any city over 2,500 inhabitants, and to such cities only where the roads are a part of a rural highway system. Now, when we stop and think for a minute that at least 90 per cent of all the appropriations that Congress makes go into the cities and only about 10 per cent go to the country, taking into consideration at this time, too, that \$50,000,000,000 of our wealth is in our farms and property on the farms, and that 50,000,000 of our people out of our 100,000,000 population live in the rural communities and in cities and villages of less than 2,500, we are led to the conclusion that it is only a matter of justice to appropriate some money that will directly benefit our rural population.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman tell me where he got the information that only 10 per cent of all the appropriations made by the Congress goes outside of the cities of this country?

Mr. BROWNE. I got it from people who compute it.

Mr. SNELL. It is just a general statement, no real authority?

Mr. BROWNE. No; it is from authorities who have given it consideration. Now, another proposition here. During this war we know this: All the war industries have been located in the large cities, mostly throughout the East, because they could be more advantageously used, and as a result the labor from all over the country has flocked to the cities, and millions of dollars have been spent there. The pay rolls in a great



many cities have doubled and trebled, and the population has increased several hundred thousand in some cities during these war times. Now, much of the wealth that has accumulated in the cities during this time has been at the expense of the country. The country suffered from this war, the small town has suffered during this war, and it is only fair from an economical standpoint to bring some of this money that has gone to the cities back to the country. We know that in the year 1917, right in the city of New York, there were five men who made a net income of over a million dollars a month, the five making over \$60,000,000 in a single year. We know there were five others who made a net income of over \$27,000,000 in a single year. We know in the year 1917, during the war, we created nearly 8,000 millionaires, while in all the 140 years of our national life we had only about 14,000 millionaires. I am just simply illustrating that the cities during these war times have grown richer. The city banks are full of money, and the country, the rural community, has suffered by the war; the country bank has suffered greatly and the country people in general have.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The country now is going to be protected by the price of wheat, is it not?

Mr. BROWNE. We fixed the price of wheat, to the injury of farmers. Our farmers made a sacrifice. It would have been a great deal better for the farmer if we had not fixed the price of wheat. We did not fix the price of a great many city products. We tried to fix the price of steel but could not do it, and as a result the steel companies have made a great deal more than ever at any time in their history.

Mr. TREADWAY. Before the gentleman gets away from the subject of roads, which is very interesting, I would like to ask him two questions in reference to that matter.

Mr. BROWNE. I would like to finish up what I was going to say—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWNE. Can I have some more time?

Mr. STEENERSON. I yield the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. I want to ask the gentleman two questions. The first is, How many miles of road have actually been built under the original road act, not arranged for but actually constructed? Second, What has been the total expenditure by the department so far in furnishing the preliminary details, which I judge the gentleman refers to when he speaks of the machinery being ready to operate? I think those are two pertinent questions as applied to the subject we are supposed to be discussing.

Mr. BROWNE. I do not know just exactly the number of miles of road, but I know this: I wrote to the Director of Roads of the United States Department of Agriculture, and in his letter of February 15, 1919, he says this:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.  
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,  
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1919.

Hon. EDWARD E. BROWNE,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWNE: Your letter of February 14 citing the apportionments to the States under the Federal aid road act for the first four years has been received, and the figures you quote are approximately correct. At the present time \$25,000,000 remains to be apportioned under the original act.

With regard to the attitude of the States in taking up these apportionments under the law there is no doubt whatever. They are doing everything they can and appear eager to secure the assistance which the Government extends. As to their financial ability to absorb the appropriation under the present act there has been no trouble so far with the first four apportionments. On December 31, when the first three apportionments only were available, amounting to approximately \$29,000,000, projects had been initiated by the States covering approximately \$22,500,000, and six months still remained of the current fiscal year. As of the same date agreements (contracts) had been entered into for approximately \$10,300,000.

When it is considered that during the last year a very strenuous effort was made through the Capital Issues Committee and the United States Highways Council to limit bond issues, to restrict transportation and materials, and to force the general postponement of the highway programs in the several States the above showing indicates that there was no lack of financial resources available to the States to meet Federal aid. Even under the conditions existing, some States, notably Texas, submitted projects in excess of their apportionments, and no State lost any of its aid by reason of the time limits fixed by the law.

The fourth apportionment listed in your letter was made on January 7 of this year and is available to the States until two years from June 30 next before it lapses, so that it appears entirely probable that this apportionment will likewise be absorbed by the States within the allotted time.

We know that several States have authorized, or are about to authorize, very substantial bond issues, notably Illinois, Pennsylvania, California, North and South Carolina, and Georgia, and other States have made legislative appropriations specifically to meet the entire apportionment under the law throughout the five-year period. With this disposition so generally in evidence there appears to be no doubt that all of the

appropriation covered by the present act will easily be taken up within the prescribed time.

This bureau has no specific information that would indicate the exact capacity of the several States to absorb further appropriations, but if the time limit is not restricted below that of the present act in force it appears very probable that the States are desirous and ready to make provision for very heavy expenditures on road improvement.

Yours, very truly,

P. ST. J. WILSON,  
Acting Director.

FEBRUARY 14, 1919.

P. ST. J. WILSON,  
Chief Engineer, Office of Public Roads  
and Rural Engineering, Department of Agriculture.

MY DEAR SIR: I understand the allotment of Federal aid to the States has been as follows:

1916	\$4,850,000
1917	9,700,000
1918	14,550,000
1919	19,400,000
	48,500,000
	\$75,000,000
	-48,500,000
	26,500,000

This would leave \$26,500,000 which has not been apportioned to the States. Please let me know whether these are the correct figures and whether the highway department believes that the States are in a position to undertake road improvement on a scale which the Post Office appropriation would justify.

I am heartily in favor of this road legislation and want to get the facts.

Yours, very truly,

Now, that is as far as I can answer the gentleman's question. Mr. TREADWAY. That does not answer either question, does it?

Mr. BROWNE. I know in the State of Wisconsin, where I am familiar with the road work, we have a system of 5,000 miles of roads, and we have used our Government funds—I think practically all that was apportioned to us up to that time. We took it as fast as the road law that we passed provided for. Of course, under our road law all of it was not available, or would not be available until 1920 and 1921, under the original act, and of course we were delayed during the war. That is not an argument against the road system or does not show any extravagance or any waste. The great doubt in the mind of some when we started in on Federal aid was waste, but there has not been any waste.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is there any way of proving that up? I am trying to find out what the establishment of this machinery, you refer to has cost the Government so far. If the establishment of machinery is an expensive proposition, there has been waste.

Mr. BROWNE. The Government does not do any work on the road, but simply looks at the road after it is built. They first have to approve of the project when it is put on paper and see whether it is a main traveled road that meets the requirements of the law—a thing that is anticipated under this act. After that is done the State has to make estimates, and the Federal road department must approve of those estimates; and after the road is built they look over the road, and if it is built according to specifications they approve it and pay the amount the Federal Government is to pay, not exceeding 50 per cent; and they can not pay any amount until more work has been done on the road than the amount they are to pay as their share.

#### TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM.

President Wilson, in his message before Congress December 2, 1918, said:

What the country chiefly needs is that all possible means of transportation should be developed—its railways, its waterways, its highways, and its countryside roads.

The highways must be considered just as much an essential part of our transportation system as the railways and waterways. Every wagon road serves a local use, a State use, and a national use. Over every wagon road are carried the crops from the farm to the near-by railroad station, and from there the products of the farm find their way into interstate commerce, and many times do not reach their destination until they cross the seas and are sold to the foreign consumer. It is the stupendous wealth of the farm which begins its journey in wagons over the country roads that, after supplying our home demands, finds its way abroad to turn the balance of trade in our favor and to bring to our shores the golden stream of wealth that makes for national prosperity.

#### WHAT FOOD ADMINISTRATOR HOOVER SAYS.

The Food Administrator, Mr. Hoover, in September, 1918, told the regional directors of the highway-transportation committee:

For 10 years after peace comes the productivity of the United States will be called upon to help. The world is never more than 60 days ahead of famine between harvests, and in consequence of the draining



of men from the usual occupation of food production large areas of Europe to-day are facing starvation. If we are to do our duty by the world and ourselves, we must utilize every means to increase production and distribute food efficiency.

The rural motor-truck express using the highways of the country commands every moral support of which we are capable. It is obvious that highway development must precede or be carried on simultaneously with motor-truck development. The cost of hauling over the average unimproved roads has been estimated by good authority at 21 cents per ton-mile. The cost of hauling over improved roads is estimated at less than 13 cents per ton-mile, making a saving of 8 cents per ton-mile.

#### GROSS TONNAGE.

The gross tonnage to be hauled over the highways of the United States on an average year is over 700,000,000 tons. This computation was made by a joint committee of Congress on Federal aid in 1914. The average haul computed at 9 miles makes a gross saving on the transportation over improved roads of 72 cents per ton. This, multiplied by the gross tonnage, gives \$504,000,000 the saving per year through improved roads. In other words, the United States has been paying a penalty of more than \$504,000,000 per year in the excessive cost of the transportation of our agricultural products alone because of its neglect of its highways. The heaviest tax that the people of the United States are paying to-day is the poor-road or mud tax. Quite a portion of this tax falls on the ultimate consumer and is shared by the laboring man in the city as well as the producer on the farm.

#### GOOD ROADS.

The question of good roads concerns everybody. At one end of every road is the farmer with his crops for sale, which aggregated last year over \$15,000,000,000. At the other end of the road is the city with its people waiting to be fed, with merchants waiting for trade, and with the railroad waiting for goods to transport. To whose advantage is it to have good roads? For the farmer to come to town it is clearly to the advantage of the merchant in the city and the railroads as much as it is to the farmer. Every man's house faces on a road that connects with every other road and leads to every other man's door and to every market place throughout the land. The farm and the farmer are the great and abiding support of the city.

#### WAR CONDITIONS.

Our Labor Department tells us that there are now many thousands of men who want work, that are out of employment. In the course of a few months there will be demobilized at least one and a half million soldiers. In a few months the millions of men that have been engaged in manufacturing munitions and other war material will be demobilized. The United States must be ready to take care of this surplus supply of labor. The men who have been in the Army and Navy must be given work until they can get back to their former employment. War industries must be given time to adjust themselves. The only solution of this very important and critical situation is that the Federal Government engage in some great public work that will give employment to labor. Many suggestions have been made as to the kind of public work this Government should engage in.

#### HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT WILL SOLVE THE LABOR PROBLEM.

I contend that the improvement of our highways will solve the labor problem. Improvement of our highways will give employment to the skilled engineer, draftsman, and common laborer, and to many of our crippled soldiers. Every man that has any work in him can be utilized in road building, which will afford a healthful, out-of-doors employment.

#### \* NO DELAY NECESSARY.

Each one of the 48 States has a splendidly organized highway department, and most of the States have mapped-out road systems, with specifications, surveys, and plans already approved by the National Government. Many of our State legislatures are now in session, ready to make appropriations to enable them to place a dollar beside every dollar appropriated by the National Government for highway improvement. The National Government has tens of thousands of trucks and other road machinery that will be turned over to the highway departments under this bill and will be of inestimable value. The Federal-aid law, which was passed by the Sixty-fourth Congress and became a law July 11, 1916, has been tried, found workable, and has greatly stimulated road building throughout the United States. The apportionment of the money appropriated by the Federal Government has been considered the fairest and most equitable apportionment of public funds among the several States that has as yet been devised. Every State is satisfied, and the rural population in every State in the Union is asking Congress to make this appropriation. There will be no delays,

no experiments. Each of the 48 States has the necessary organization to begin work on the great trunk highways within its borders. Nothing is lacking except the cooperation of the National Government for this appropriation for which this legislation will provide.

#### ECONOMIC JUSTICE.

In the last two years the people of the United States have had only one objective, and that has been winning the war. Able-bodied men all over the United States who were not in the military service of their country responded to the call of the Commander in Chief, President Wilson, and have worked long hours in producing munitions of war, building ships, and in the various war industries. Every law of trade had to give way to efficiency in the location of the great manufacturing plants. As a result the large cities, especially those cities in the eastern part of the United States, had their populations increased by the hundreds of thousands, their pay rolls many times doubled and tripled. These fortunate localities and many of their citizens have greatly profited by the war.

Contrast the prosperity of the city with that of the country.

#### FINANCIAL DEPRESSION IN THE COUNTRY.

During the period of the war the country, including the small towns and cities, has suffered great financial loss. It has responded patriotically to every demand made upon it by the Government, but it has made great sacrifices to do so. The country banks have been unable to accommodate many of their former patrons, and it will take years before the rural part of this country will recover from the effects of this war. Many small industries throughout the country were unable to carry on their business because they could not get material and labor, as they were not manufacturing war supplies or products that were deemed essentials, and as a consequence were obliged to go out of business or fail.

#### HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT.

The expenditure of several millions of dollars in the rural communities of each of the 48 States and the employment of thousands of men will bring back to the different rural communities some of the money that has accumulated in the cities by reason of the segregation of our great war industries and will greatly add to the prosperity of the rural communities during a time when they are readjusting themselves to new conditions. To-day we are threatened with a slowing up of production. We are at the same time threatened with an increased labor supply by reason of the disbanding of three and one-half million soldiers and the demobilization of from five to ten million men in war industries. Every effort should be made to prevent panic and financial distress. The high cost of living will not be altered to any extent, because the purchasing price of a dollar has practically been cut in two. If our soldiers return home jobless, with empty pockets, and the millions of laboring men that have been working in the war industries are thrown out of employment while those industries are adjusting themselves to new conditions, this country will face the most severe crisis that has ever confronted it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, have the Members of the Sixty-fifth Congress gone absolutely stark mad in a desire to expend money? Have we absolutely forgotten that the time has come right now when we must stop making these extravagant lump-sum expenditures? Are we absolutely unmindful of the fact that every dollar of this must some day be paid from the savings of the people? Have we become so accustomed to dealing in hundreds of millions and billions of dollars that we can not get our feet down to earth and look at a proposition in a sane and businesslike way? When we have just passed a revenue bill, or a tax on our people, so big that you did not dare to levy it at one time for fear that it would absolutely strangle the business of this country, a bill so large that the American people, as rich and powerful as we are, are obliged to take four bites before they can swallow it, the time has come for the American Congress to stop, look, and listen. And I tell you right here now that unless the Members of this House do this, and in some way consider the people who pay the taxes, somebody else will be here to do it for you. They will not keep us here.

Mr. BROWNE. Will the gentleman yield?



Mr. SNELL. In just a minute I will yield.

Now, as I look at this proposition it is not a question of whether you are in favor of good roads or not. Practically every man is in favor of good roads. It is simply a question of whether we can afford it and need to appropriate this money at this time. I believe that we should cut our garment according to the cloth, and we certainly have no cloth to cut this garment out of at the present time.

Now, the chairman of this committee made quite an extended talk in regard to economy and what we must do. He also said we had expended \$20,000,000,000, but that was a matter behind us and we need not bother with that now. Let me tell you, gentlemen of the House, he is very much mistaken. It is very much before us. The paying of that twenty billions is yet to be done, and the American people will know it when they pay it. He calls for economy and then brings in a proposition to this House to embark on a problem where the initial expense is \$200,000,000, and then says he had no information in regard to it. I asked him that question, and he said it was put on at the other end of the Capitol and he did not know anything about it. I want to gain some information. Do the people want us to continue passing these appropriations without any information or not? I do not believe they do.

Now, the recklessness with which we add riders to appropriation bills, I think, should be called to the attention of the whole country.

The time has come when they should be cut out. Nine times out of ten these riders are such they will not stand on their own footing, and it is necessary to attach them to some appropriation bill in order to get them through the House, and thus force us to vote for them or defeat the whole bill, and they know we can not do that.

Now, let us consider for just a minute what the actual conditions are in connection with the road situation. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] asked some questions that are very pertinent to this legislation and I am going to answer him. We have left under the original appropriation of \$75,000,000 over \$70,000,000 unexpended. In the two years it has been available we have spent only a little over \$4,000,000, and there are over \$70,000,000 available at the present time, and that is more money than you can possibly spend this year and the proponents of this bill know it, but they want to take advantage of the situation and get the legislation on the statute books and the money appropriated regardless. Now, the gentleman asked the question as to how many miles of road have been actually built under this appropriation. I can tell him. There have been just 45 miles completed up to the present time in the whole country.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SNELL. In just a minute.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What information is that based upon?

Mr. SNELL. A report from the Labor Department, issued yesterday. That is my information.

There have been approved by the Agricultural Department for Federal aid under the original act, which really does not mean very much, 7,889 miles of road. That is, plans have been made for building that much road this year. And every thinking man knows that is more road than you can possibly build this year, and when you can not expend this money you now have on hand what on earth is the use of appropriating more at this time when we have so much money that necessarily must be raised and paid by the American people this year?

Mr. TREADWAY. Can the gentleman answer the other question I asked the gentleman from Wisconsin, as to the cost of establishing the so-called machinery, or operation, which I take to be in cooperation between the Federal Government and the States?

Mr. SNELL. No, sir. I have not any information along that line.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it not possible that the \$5,000,000 to which he refers has something to do with that expenditure in view of the fact that only 45 miles of road have been constructed in that cooperative manner?

Mr. SNELL. Maybe so. Although Federal aid for State roads has been available since 1917, only eight States report road projects involving Federal aid completed. The department states that Arkansas has completed one project of 5.1 miles.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. In just a minute. California, two projects, 6.7 miles; Louisiana, one of 4 miles; Massachusetts, one of 13.8 miles; North Carolina, one of 8 miles; Vermont, one of less than 1 mile; Washington, one of 3.5 miles; West Virginia, one of 2.5 miles. That is all that has been done so far. But there

have been approved, of projects in those States, to be built out of money on hand at the present time, nearly 8,000 miles of the roads. But they have not yet been touched, and not a stroke of work done upon them.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. I know this applies to California and all other places, that the Capital Issues Committee refused to grant its consent to the use of funds for the construction of these roads, and therefore during the war the road construction has been delayed because of the need of funds.

Mr. SNELL. I entirely agree with the gentleman, and I have no contention with him on that matter. But I do maintain that we have more money on hand at the present time than we can possibly spend economically during this year, and when we already have that money on hand there is no reasonable excuse for appropriating at this time on this bill a provision carrying \$200,000,000 more money. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman was talking about the excessive amount of labor seeking employment, and about the soldiers returning home. Is it not a fact that there is no place in the United States where better results can be had to improve the situation than by putting unemployed men and returning soldiers to work on these roads, where they can work together?

Mr. SNELL. I do not understand so at all. From what I know about returning soldiers, they do not intend to do pick-and-shovel work. The most of them did not intend before they went to war and certainly will not now.

Mr. RAKER. Why not?

Mr. SNELL. Because throughout our State such pick-and-shovel work of road construction is largely done by foreigners.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, 90 per cent of the roads now being constructed are done by machines.

Mr. SNELL. Then you do not need to have this legislation in order to provide employment for more labor in this country. [Applause.] And that is one reason why it is presented at this time. There certainly could be no other reason.

Mr. RAKER. But it requires labor to run the machinery.

Mr. SNELL. Oh, yes; but only a comparatively few, and the main argument is to furnish employment for labor.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. What part was contributed by the Government toward the construction of these roads?

Mr. SNELL. Fifty per cent.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I understand that is the case in this bill also?

Mr. SNELL. Yes. I understand the same conditions are to continue.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. This bill carries \$200,000,000?

Mr. SNELL. Yes; in addition to the original \$75,000,000.

Now, in order to spend the money economically you have got to work out a complete system in each State, and there are very few States at the present time where that system has been completely and comprehensively worked out, so that they are in a position to spend this money at this time, and it will be impossible to get the benefit, so far as the employment of labor is concerned, during the present year.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Can the gentleman name me the States that have not the machinery provided under this original road bill?

Mr. SNELL. I can not give you the names.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I understood the gentleman stated there were few that had.

Mr. SNELL. I said there were some that had not. There was a misunderstanding on that.

Now, the contention I make is that we can not afford at this time to make the appropriation, because we can not spend the money even if we have it.

Mr. MADDEN. Why not?

Mr. SNELL. Because you have not the machinery to do it, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. MADDEN. No; I do not, and the gentleman from New York does not know it.

Mr. SNELL. I do know it.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no. The gentleman from New York is just making an assertion without any facts.

Mr. SNELL. But my assertion is just as good as yours. Can the gentleman tell me how you are going to make surveys and plans and make the general arrangements so we can economically spend this money this summer?



Mr. MADDEN. Yes. In nine cases out of ten the surveys are already made and everything is prepared to go on with the work. All that we need is the money and the men.

Mr. SNELL. You have got more money appropriated now than you can possibly use this year.

Mr. MADDEN. Seventy million dollars divided among 48 States is a mere bagatelle. The gentleman seems to be arguing against the opportunity of his own State for going on with the improvements.

Mr. SNELL. My own State has more roads laid out now than they can possibly build this year, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. MADDEN. That is just as I said; they have got more laid out than they can build.

Mr. SNELL. But the money is all arranged for this work, and we can not use this extra money this year.

The whole question is whether you can afford at the present time to appropriate this sum of money that you do not need at present and can not possibly spend during the present year. I say no. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I want to call attention to Senate amendment No. 38. We amended the bill on the aviation provision. The department asked for \$2,185,000 to carry out certain mail routes. We cut that down to \$300,000 and provided that the Army should carry mail whenever called upon by the Post Office Department. We directed the Army to turn over the personnel and the machines. Now, for some reason or other the Post Office Department did not want that. They went to the Senate, and they told them they could not carry the mail with Army fliers, and they had that provision stricken from the bill and asked for more money. Now they have got \$850,000.

Gentlemen, I want to tell you this, that the aero mail of this country is doomed to failure. They can not make good. They refused the machines and personnel which we wanted to give them. They want to carry it out with \$850,000, and it can not be done.

You will recall that at the end of the discussion the chairman of the committee said they would start that day with the Chicago and New York line. I told you then that the Post Office Department did not have the equipment or the personnel to start the Chicago and New York line; and, gentlemen, they have not carried a letter from New York to Chicago, and they can not do it for another year.

It is easy for the gentlemen in the Post Office Department to come and testify before a committee, but their testimony on aviation matters is pathetic in their ignorance of the subject.

Now, if we want to develop the industry, if we want to develop the aero mail in this country, we will have to go about it right. We have started right. We have saved this year on the appropriation something like \$60,000,000 on aviation that the Navy and the Army and the Post Office Department have asked for. The only way to do it, gentlemen, is to starve these people into their senses, to cut out their appropriations until they all decide to come in with a unified, single air service, the same as England, France, and Italy have; and then, with the ingenuity that we have here, and the factories and the facilities that we have, we can develop the best air machines in the world. Now, I just want to point out that if anybody expects that the Post Office Department is going to establish an aerial mail service in the United States, he should get rid of that idea, because they can not do it. This is just \$850,000 being wasted.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Briefly; yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would it be practicable to have an aerial mail service in the Northern States, and to continue it through the winter months, during the inclement weather?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Not at this time. To give you an example, they complained that they could not use the Army machines. I went to New York a few days ago, and went to Belmont Park, and they were starting four machines from New York to Bellefonte, Pa. I pleaded with every man on that field who had charge not to send out those machines on that day. It was hazy, the clouds were low, and it was impossible to make it. They said, "Oh, we fly in every kind of weather." That was not being smart; that was showing they did not know anything about aviation. They sent out those four machines, and not one of them reached its destination. Three of them crashed and one of them landed near Philadelphia. Then they came before

the Senate committee and said, "Why, the machines are no good. Mr. LAGUARDIA, of New York, was on the field one day, and he saw that we could not make it." It was not the fault of the machines; it was simply the fault of their judgment.

Mr. RANDALL. What was the practice on the front? Did the machines all wait for good weather before they went up?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes. [Applause.]

Mr. STEENERSON. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum here. I make the point of no quorum present. You shall not rob the Treasury by improper legislation without a quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURNETT). The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-two Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anderson	Farr	Maher	Stafford
Barnhart	Flynn	Miller, Minn.	Stephens, Miss.
Benson	Francis	Mott	Stevenson
Blackmon	Freeman	Nelson, J. M.	Swift
Booher	Gandy	Nolan	Tague
Borland	Gard	Norton	Taylor, Ark.
Britten	Garland	Olney	Templeton
Brodbeck	Gillett	O'Shaunessy	Thomas
Brumbaugh	Godwin, N. C.	Park	Van Dyke
Burroughs	Goodwin, Ark.	Parker, N. J.	Vare
Caldwell	Gould	Porter	Venable
Carew	Graham, Pa.	Powers	Vestal
Carlin	Gray, N. J.	Pratt	Voigt
Carter, Mass.	Hamill	Price	Volstead
Chandler, N. Y.	Heintz	Rainey, J. W.	Waldow
Church	Helm	Reavis	Walker
Copley	Helvering	Roberts	Wason
Costello	Hensley	Rowland	Watson, Va.
Cox	Johnson, Wash.	Russell	Wenver
Crago	Kahn	Sanders, N. Y.	Webb
Crisp	Kelley, Mich.	Schall	Whaley
Davis	Kennedy, R. I.	Sears	White, Ohio
Decker	Kiess, Pa.	Shackleford	Wilson, Tex.
Delaney	Langley	Shallenberger	Young, N. Dak.
Elliott	Little	Slayden	Young, Tex.
Estopinal	Littlepage	Smith, C. B.	
Fairfield	Lufkin	Smith, T. F.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 323 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I made the point of order that there was no quorum present. There were less than 60 Members on the floor. A quorum have answered—more than 300—and half of them have gone already. I know of no way to mandamus the membership of this House, including myself.

I have 10 minutes to discuss this matter, and unless you are better informed about it than I was 30 minutes ago you do not know what it is. But it is for employment, to pay out \$200,000,000 on a hop, skip, and jump. Now, in 10 minutes I can not say much, but I am going to say a little. Have you stopped to think of the condition that this country is in and that the world is in? The world has eaten up and shot away during this world war \$179,000,000,000. We have loaned a part of that—\$8,000,000,000, and more to follow after—and we have not got it back. We have made a debt to pay interest on, that we know about, that will cost \$1,000,000,000 a year, to be raised by taxation or by borrowing. God knows what the total appropriations of this Congress are to be and what will follow in the incoming Congress. I do not know and you do not know. But here is a proposition to appropriate \$200,000,000 for cooperation with the States when we have not spent \$15,000,000 for cooperation in the several years since that law was passed.

Oh, gentlemen, it is so easy to appropriate. We are to be confronted with the proposition to spend \$100,000,000 to drain land and to buy cut-over land. I have not received a letter or a request from any soldier for that proposition. How many have you received? Hold up your hands. Not one. There is a propaganda going on all over the country to have us make this appropriation to buy cut-over land. I have had letters from people who have cut-over lands to sell; plenty of them. I had a civil engineer come into my office last week, and have had several letters from civil engineers going back into civil life. I said to one of them, "Are you a farmer?" No. "Do you expect to go upon them and get a home?" No. "What is your inter-



est in it?" "Why," said he, "I want employment as a civil engineer; I am an educated man." There is the size of it. [Laughter.] So much for that.

Who pays in the last analysis this thousand millions of dollars interest annually on this great public debt—and it will be fifteen hundred millions of dollars interest on the public debt before the expiration of the next Congress? Who pays it? The man that consumes pays it.

"Oh, but we want to give employment to the soldiers." Good God! how many of the soldiers that are coming back would accept employment in road building? Not one-tenth of 1 per cent. It was the exclamation of Madame Roland when about to be executed, "O Liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!" Talk about "caring for the soldiers." I am for taking care of them, as we pledged ourselves to do and as we ought patriotically to do.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Really, it does not make any difference who is employed out of this money; the mere fact that somebody is employed, whether a soldier or not, will add an opportunity for soldiers to find other employment, because it creates other activities that need employment.

Mr. CANNON. Who speaks now? My honorable colleague, for whom I have great respect. He says, "It does not make any difference whether we employ a soldier or not." Now, are we going to employ foreigners? Flimsy! It is not worthy—I will not say it is not worthy of my honorable colleague, whom I respect and love; but if he can not give a better excuse than that, it ought to be turned down. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, gentlemen, I am at work in the committee room on another deficiency bill. Somebody whispered and said, "Do you know the Post Office appropriation bill is up?" I left the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] in there alone by himself to continue the work. I wanted to come in and see how I ought to vote on this proposition. Why, gentlemen, the soldier will take care of himself when he comes back—three million or three million and a half of them. They were good stuff when they went into the Army [applause], and those who come back wounded we will care for. We will care for them by compensating them as they are entitled to be cared for. We will pay the insurance where life is lost. We can not do too much for the soldiers; but, oh, what mistakes we are liable to make in saying "We are taking care of the soldiers." I want the soldier to get what we appropriate for him. [Applause.] I do not want the cry to take care of the soldier under false pretense of caring for the soldier and then squander the appropriation for something that does not take care of the soldier.

Say, do you know how much we have already expended and what the debt is? If you have not reckoned it up, you do not. Do you know what is to be paid as interest? If you have not inquired, you do not.

You may say, "Oh, well, I would like to have it when I go back to Illinois, Minnesota, or Iowa; I would just like to take home this thing to appeal to the people and say, 'Here is what we have done for you.'"

Yes; what else have we done? We can not eternally borrow to pay the interest on the public debt. We can not eternally borrow to fill up the vacuum we are creating by providing money not needed and that we can not get except by borrowing. Now, one of two things is to happen: On the one hand the world debt is to be repudiated—and I warn gentlemen that you have got to meet that issue—or it is to be charged over upon the consumers of the country—and we are all consumers, and the tax burdens of our respective States and the National Government will pile up and up and up.

If I am right, I want you to think along that line and vote as I shall vote; for if I am but the one man against this conference report I shall vote against it. The way to get a Post Office bill is to turn down this conference report and send this bill back to conference with the Senate conferees, with the instruction not to agree to this \$200,000,000 appropriation for construction of roads throughout the country when the \$60,000,000 appropriated in 1916 is substantially unspent. Mr. Speaker, this Congress ceases to exist on the 4th day of March, 1919. You Democrats are in the saddle until that time and are responsible for unwise appropriations. We Republicans of the House will become responsible after the 4th of March next for the action of the House. As one Member, I will not vote for this appropriation.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a table furnished by the Agricultural Department showing the amount of the \$200,000,000 of good roads that will go to each State in the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing therein a table. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, we have heard some criticism upon this conference report, but I think on careful consideration you will agree with me that it ought to be adopted. The statement has been made that the House has yielded on a great many points of disagreement with the Senate. Most of those points were matters about which there was no dispute, because they consisted in specific increases in salaries which we had increased in the general provisions of our bill, so that a great many of these Senate amendments were simply carrying out legislation that we had already provided but which we had not specified in each instance. So far as extravagance is concerned, I want to say this, that the Postal Service is a service established for the convenience of the people and ought to be carried on for their benefit at cost, or approximately at cost. This service consists, as you all know, in the payment of salaries of clerks and carriers and officials, inspectors, postmasters, and so on, and we all know that salaries generally have been increased within the last two or three years, so that if the bill carries a larger sum than before, it is explained by the fact that compensation of every kind—for labor and for official services—has increased generally. The receipts of the Post Office Department in the last fiscal year were something over \$380,000,000. The normal increase for a period of years has been about 6 per cent per year, so that if we have the same ratio of increase in that as in the past we would increase the rates something like twenty or twenty-one million dollars a year. Last year showed a surplus over expenditures in the Postal Service of something like \$20,000,000, and if this bill gives a \$40,000,000 increase in salaries we are simply bringing it up to where it ought to be. It can not be charged as extravagance when you pay your servants who do the work for you, who carry these letters by day and by night through rain and sunshine, what they ought to receive in compensation and which corresponds with the compensation in other employments. That is not extravagance. Take the compensation of the rural carriers. Congress last year increased it 20 per cent, and we made that increase permanent in the House bill. The Senate increased it to 25 per cent. Before the House yielded, a matter was brought to our attention which was very instructive to me and which influenced my mind. The House had provided for a garage at Union Station, down here near the post office, to cost some \$40,000 or \$50,000. The Senate struck it out. The postmaster of Washington, Mr. Chance, wrote a letter, which was read to the committee, in which he said that the present garage is one and one-tenth miles from the present Union Station post office, and that it costs so much to bring the automobiles over from that garage and to take them back, and that the saving in transportation for three or four years would more than pay for the rent of the garage.

He said that the cost per mile with the driver would average 25 cents; and if it costs 25 cents per mile to move an automobile from the Union Station post office over to the garage on asphalt pavement, then would it not cost that much to move an automobile on a highway in the country, and, at 25 cents per mile, the rural carrier would get \$1,800 on a 24-mile route, paying him nothing for his extra services as clerk of the post office, issuing money orders, and so forth, simply paying him as a driver and cost of maintaining equipment.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Last year, under an order made by the Postmaster General, the rural carriers' salaries were increased 15 per cent. Is this 20 or 25 per cent increase carried in the conference report an increase over the 15 per cent?

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, no. The increase made last year was 20 per cent. The committee reported, as the gentleman says, 15 per cent, but on the floor of the House it was increased to 20 per cent, and now the Senate added 5 per cent, so that the total increase is 25 per cent from former basic salary.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. For a short question.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman state right there what is the compensation of a rural carrier?

Mr. STEENERSON. The compensation on the standard route of 24 miles will be \$1,500. As reported to the House, the bill provided for \$1,440, but the 5 per cent increase makes it \$1,500—\$60 additional put on by the Senate. The House yielded on that increase. This gives you a compensation for a rural carrier, whether he furnishes the horse or the motor vehicle upon the so-called horse-drawn vehicle routes of 24 miles, less com-



pensation per mile than it actually costs here. You give \$300 less than it costs to run an automobile of ordinary size upon a paved street. We are simply increasing the compensation that he is entitled to by reason of the increased cost in operation and of his equipment. The actual pay per day of the rural carrier for his labor has not been increased.

Mr. SNYDER. Just one more question, to finish this up. Will the gentleman tell us what the extra compensation of the rural carrier is when he goes extra mileage?

Mr. STEENERSON. He gets \$24 per mile per year for each mile in excess of 24. So that the charge of extravagance is not well founded. We are simply appropriating an amount which seems large, but which will be made up, we hope, if business is good next year, by the increased postal receipts. The Postal Service should be run so as to be self-sustaining, and we think that it will be. It is not a burden to the taxpayer as long as it is self-sustaining. The charge of extravagance does not apply.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. LOBECK. What was the increase in receipts because of the 3-cent postage against the 2?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will explain that. The 3-cent postage never went to the postal receipts at all.

That is estimated monthly and paid into the Treasury for the benefit of the general fund, and we have never counted that when we counted the receipts, as I have stated.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will.

Mr. LOBECK. These increased receipts this year have not been counted in?

Mr. STEENERSON. Certainly not; the gentleman is correct. We do not count that at all, and they will be abolished as soon as the next fiscal year begins, I understand. So they are absolutely to be disregarded.

Now, in regard to this disputed road provision. Can the charge of extravagance be laid against it at this time? The Post Office Committee never considered that, so far as the House committee was concerned. They are not to blame that it comes into the bill. It was put on as a kind of rider by the Senate committee, and they insisted on the provision. Now, if it had been something with which we were ignorant, something that had not been understood, it would perhaps be proper to throw it out, but I want to say that we created a special committee of this House to study the road question. They have studied that question for years; they brought in what is believed by all fair-minded men to-day to be the fairest division of money to be contributed by the National Government to improve the roads that has ever been devised. It is based on the compound system of allowing for distance, population, road mileage, rural-route mileage, so that it gave satisfaction. The House of Representatives agreed to that road law almost unanimously, and this provision here is simply a provision that increases the allotment under the road law. It is limited here in this provision to postal roads. Of course, the post roads are under the jurisdiction of the Post Office Committees of both Houses, so that in increasing the allotment which was made under the original road act, which was administered by the Department of Agriculture, we were simply taking advantage of an existing law to increase the amount of road construction that was to be made in the next two years. Now, some say it is a bad time to build roads, because everything costs so much. Well, I do not know that there is very great argument in that. If wages are high, of course they are no higher in that line than anything else. Roads are undoubtedly needed in the country. A good road is a matter of economy, it is a good investment. It is what may be called and is called a productive investment, because it cheapens transportation, and therefore every dollar you put into that kind of an investment is a profitable dollar. It earns more than it costs in interest to the public.

We thought it was an opportune time for many reasons to increase this road work in the different States and encourage it by Federal aid. One reason was that there might be a number of soldiers returning who wanted this kind of employment and this kind of employment was increased by this appropriation. Another thing was that the War Department is supposed to be in possession of a great many motor trucks and road-making machines that they have used in the war and which will be absolutely worthless unless they are utilized at this time for that purpose. We are not expecting another war, and all these things that we have acquired for road making perhaps can be availed of now for this useful work, and who can better use them than the soldier who is familiar with them? These machines, these motor trucks and powerful machinery, can be handled by them, as it is believed. Another thing was that the States

have only recently been awakened to the advantage of availing themselves of this Federal aid. Many of them have engaged to contribute a sufficient amount, and they are showing signs that they are coming in, and the more that come in the more roads will be built and the more roads that are built the better it will be for the whole country.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield, if it will not interrupt him?

Mr. STEENERSON. I yield.

Mr. DENISON. I want to ask if this provision, in reference to the employment of soldiers in connection with the construction of roads, was put in the bill for the purpose of helping the soldiers or for the purpose of helping the road proposition?

Mr. STEENERSON. Well, it was probably to help the roads. We simply put that clause in that preference shall be given to the soldier if he wants work of this kind. The wages, as I understand, for running machinery are from \$5 a day up, and it is good employment—out-of-door employment—and if they desire it they should be preferred over anyone else. That is all there is to it. We do not expect a great many to avail themselves of it.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman understands, of course, the Government does not initiate any of this road construction at all?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will not discuss that.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman permit one observation? The gentleman also ought to know, if he does not know, that these contracts for State roads are let to contractors, who control the question of who they shall employ to build the roads. Does the gentleman understand that?

Mr. STEENERSON. Probably they are, but I will not discuss it.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. For a question.

Mr. WALSH. Does this scheme which is provided in this bill require the States to appropriate \$200,000,000 before they can take advantage of Federal aid?

Mr. STEENERSON. It does not require anything; but if they want \$200,000,000 from the Federal Government, they will have to appropriate \$200,000,000 of State funds, and if they want \$50,000 they will have to appropriate \$50,000. Some States have constitutional provisions that prevent them from contributing the amount required to enable them to receive the full allotment of Federal aid under the road act. One of these States is Minnesota. The bill now before you contains a proviso as follows:

*Provided, That where the constitution of any State prohibits the same from engaging upon internal improvements, or from contracting public debts for extraordinary purposes in an amount sufficient to meet the monetary requirements of the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, or restricts annual tax levies for the purpose of constructing and improving roads and bridges, and where a constitutional alteration or amendment to overcome either or all of such prohibitions must be submitted to a referendum at a general election, the sum to which such State is entitled under the method of apportionment provided in the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, shall be withdrawn by the Secretary of the Treasury from the principal fund appropriated by the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, upon receipt of the certification of the governor of such State to the existence of either or all of said prohibitions, and such sum shall be carried by the Secretary of the Treasury as a separate fund for future disbursement as hereinafter provided: *Provided further, That when, by referendum, the constitutional alterations or amendments necessary to the enjoyment of the sum so withdrawn have been approved and ratified by any State, the Secretary of the Treasury, upon receipt of certification from the governor of such State to such effect, shall immediately make available to such State, for the purposes set forth in the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, the sum withdrawn as hereinbefore provided: *Provided further, That nothing herein shall be deemed to prevent any State from receiving such portion of said principal sum as is available under its existing constitution and laws.***

This will give such States the opportunity to change their constitutions and thus enable them to avail themselves of the Federal aid allotted to them.

The amount available to Minnesota from the Federal Treasury under existing law and pending provision during the next three years will be \$7,814,682.78; that is, in the event that she amends her constitution so as to permit her to contribute an equal amount. I believe the legislature has already taken steps to submit the question to the voters, and if they approve there will be a total of \$15,629,365.56 available.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Tennessee has 15 minutes, if he desires to use that time.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker: This is no new road legislation. Permit me to call the attention of the House to the fact this bill merely carries an appropriation in aid of the



existing road act, and every dollar hereby appropriated will be expended in conformity with the terms of a measure which this body heretofore passed with practical unanimity. And let me say another thing in this connection. This bill has not been offered to the House as a bill that ought to be passed merely because it contains a provision referring to the returning soldiers. No such contention has been, or is being made. This appropriation will be in aid of road work in the United States under a comprehensive existing law. Wisely, it contains a provision to the effect that any soldier desiring employment on road work shall be given preferential consideration. Who is there that will object to this provision? Permit me to go a step further, and point out that there will be a considerable number of soldiers who will secure employment in this connection, although the bill is not offered on the ground that it will be exclusively, or even chiefly for the benefit of the soldiers.

In the first place, a great deal of machinery is used in the process of modern road building, and many of the soldiers returning from abroad, who have been in the motor transport, or other mechanical service, will apply for and secure employment as expert operators of this machinery.

Mr. ROSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will.

Mr. ROSE. Under the present law, as I understand it, the Agricultural Department is permitted to appropriate the sum of \$10,000 per mile to any State in the building of roads. If I understand this bill properly the only thing this amendment does is to increase the appropriation already made by law.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have already stated in the most emphatic fashion that this is precisely what this bill will do. In this connection I will state that the limit of contribution under the act of 1916 on the part of the United States was \$10,000 a mile. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULD] came before the Roads Committee of this body, and pointed out that in view of the cost of modern road construction, growing in part out of the war, and in part out of other causes, this limit was too low, and should be raised. The Roads Committee agreed with this contention, and reported a bill which is incorporated as an amendment in the pending measure, raising this limit to \$20,000 a mile. Pass this bill, and the State of New York which will derive something like \$14,000,000 from the appropriations herein made, will be able to employ that fund as aid in building roads that may cost as much as \$40,000 a mile. But to return to the soldiers.

Engineers will be needed in all of the States in connection with road construction. Many of the soldiers returning from the war are engineers, and will find employment in this field. Foremen of construction will also be needed, and the returning soldiers will supply these foremen. Many of the soldiers drafted into the American Army were men engaged at the time in road work in the States. I have no doubt that a considerable proportion of these men when they return to private life will naturally turn to their former line of work which they will find actively in progress, and affording opportunities of immediate employment at attractive wages. So that it will be true that in the aggregate many soldiers will secure employment in connection with the road activities that this appropriation will set in motion.

Yet the advocates of this measure do not present it on the sole ground that it is designed to aid the soldiers, but, rather, on the ground that in a large way it will benefit the entire country, and incidentally will afford attractive employment to a very considerable number of returning soldiers. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEX] has pointed out, and very justly, this appropriation will stimulate road construction on a large scale in the States. This construction will not only call for labor, but for tools and machinery. This will mean orders for the industrial plants, and activity in those plants, so that the actions and reactions that this construction will effect, will play no inconsiderable part in our economic readjustment from a war, to a peace basis.

These activities will afford employment on a considerable scale, and in many communities, in every State in the Union, and the political economists are agreed that the employment of labor at this time is a vital issue.

A number of questions have been asked by the opponents of this appropriation, some of them reasonable and entitled to an answer, others showing an entire lack of acquaintance with the provisions of the original road act. One gentleman wishes to know how much has been expended up to the present time under this act. How is it an argument against the proposed appropriation that all of the appropriations heretofore made has not been expended? It is enough to know that what has been expended, has been expended economically and judiciously. As a matter of fact, since the road act went into effect, two

years ago, road building has been below normal in the States, though there has been much activity in preparing for road work on a large scale with the return of peace. In my own State road construction, and even road maintenance have been practically suspended during that period.

For what purpose do the gentlemen opposed to this appropriation bring this fact of suspended activity, into this discussion? Do they wish that state of suspended animation to continue? The money heretofore appropriated is still available for future construction. The appropriation in this bill merely serves to enlarge this fund and increase the scale on which roads will be built during the next three years. Now that our efforts in the war have been crowned with victory, the whole world will soon be knocking at our doors for our raw materials and finished products. The work of destruction has come to an end, the work of reconstruction must begin. A necessary part of this work of reconstruction will be the reconstruction of our highways. The need for this reconstruction has been fully recognized, and within the last 12 months under the stimulus of potential Federal aid many States have voted great sums to build modern highways of the latest and most approved type. Traffic on the railroads is approaching its limit, for rails will carry just so much, and no more. "But the modern highways with the motor transport, and an efficient system of rural motor express, can and will bear any burden thrust upon it. The highways are the natural arteries, while the motor truck is the transportation medium that will bind us together as a Nation."

Mr. SNYDER. Does not the gentleman think the question was raised due to the fact that there is still \$70,000,000 of the appropriation not expended?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Not \$70,000,000 derived from the United States. That is where the gentleman makes a mistake. This \$70,000,000 is composed in part of Federal, and in part of State contributions, but the entire sum is available for present road work. To that sum this bill will add \$50,000,000 to be used during the year 1919.

Mr. SNYDER. And much of it has been allotted and not spent?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. All has been allotted, but very little spent. The bulk of the appropriations for the past two years, which only amounted to \$15,000,000 for the years 1917, and 1918, and \$15,000,000 for the year 1919, has not been expended for the reasons that I have mentioned. What argument do you derive from that fact? If the States have not been able to spend this money, it has not been wasted. It is still available for road purposes under the act of 1916.

Mr. MANN. For information I would like to ask the gentleman a question. He stated awhile ago that they had authorized road building up to \$30,000 a mile. Was it not \$40,000?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It may have been \$40,000. I think the amount was changed in the Senate from the amount reported in the House bill.

Mr. MANN. I simply wanted the information.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman is probably right. A Member from the State of New York came before our committee, and asked to have the road act amended, so that Federal aid could be given to an amount greater than \$10,000 to the mile.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman said \$30,000 a mile. Whether that meant two-thirds contribution by the General Government and one-third by the State I did not know.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I referred to the total cost of the roads on which the Federal aid was proposed to be applied. The road act limited the application of Federal money to \$10,000, a mile, that is one-half of the cost of a road costing \$20,000, a mile. Under the Senate amendment a State can use its quota to the extent of one-half of the cost of a road not to exceed \$40,000 a mile. That is to say that the new limit of cost for the Federal money will be \$20,000, a mile.

Mr. SNYDER. The other reason for making that observation was it was thought on the part of some gentlemen here that if it has taken two years to spend less than \$5,000,000, we could not possibly spend \$70,000,000 this year.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Does the gentleman think that is a fair criticism, having in mind the conditions in the United States during the past two years?

Mr. SNYDER. I do know—

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not think it is.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman will not let me answer.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. My time is too short to permit the gentleman to make a speech in my time. I would be perfectly willing to yield to him if I had more time.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman knows that the Capital Issues Committee has practically stopped all road building, does he not?



Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes. In all parts of the United States both road building and road maintenance have been practically suspended during the last two years. It has also been stated in the course of this debate that the States are not in shape to do this road construction economically at the present time. That is a mistake. Most of the States are now provided with all the organization and the personnel necessary to expend every dollar of this appropriation to the very greatest advantage. But concede that all of the money available for the present year, will not be expended during the calendar year 1919. The act provides that any unexpended balance in a State's quota in any one year, will be available for use in the succeeding year. With respect further to the suggestion that the States will not expend this fund economically, it may be said in reply that the Secretary of Agriculture will be responsible for any wasteful, or extravagant expenditure. The act gives the Secretary of Agriculture ample authority to protect the interests of the Federal Government. No project can be entered upon until the Secretary is satisfied that the plans provide for the proper construction of a properly located and desirable road. Moreover the Federal fund can not be drawn upon until the Secretary, acting with the aid and advice of his engineer assistants is satisfied that the road has been constructed in conformity with the plans, and at the cost which he has approved.

Another thing that I wish to say is in response to a statement made I think by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] that this bill provides an initial expenditure of \$200,000,000. That is a mistake. The bill makes an appropriation of \$200,000,000 for the next three years. That means about \$66,666,667 to be expended annually by the Federal Treasury for road building in the several States during the next three years. Is that an extravagant or prodigal sum to be expended for this great work of domestic development in the entire United States?

The fact is that but for the war and the burdens imposed by the war, the appropriation for road building should exceed one hundred millions a year. It is only the state of the Treasury and the exigent demands in other directions that hold this appropriation within the moderate limit reported. There is one further reply that may be made to the suggestion that all of the Federal appropriation has not been used during the past two years, and that is that not only has the shortage of necessary labor been very great during that time, but in addition the States in many instances have had to create the organization necessary to put themselves in shape to make avail of the Federal fund. Comprehensive road plans have had to be formulated, to be followed up by elaborate project statements. All of this work had to be done in advance of any actual construction. But these preliminary details have been largely completed, and this year will witness road building on a large scale in every section of the country. The war was won by the united effort of the whole people. That same union of effort should now be applied to the great work of economic readjustments. A thoroughly systematized and vigorously prosecuted scheme of road construction in the States will play no small part in bringing this readjustment speedily to pass.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have five minutes left?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MOON. I yield three minutes of that time to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, nor am I a member of the Committee on Good Roads. Moreover, I am a Representative of a district entirely embraced within the city of Baltimore, and yet I am very strongly in favor of good roads.

I think it is very refreshing now to have a chance to vote for an appropriation for construction and not for destruction, as we have been compelled to vote some billions for war in the past two years. I tell you that as a Representative of the State of Maryland, which has had an experience of many years in good-road building, there is nothing so valuable as good roads. Maryland is not excelled, or equaled, in good roads in all this country. We have found it very profitable, indeed, to pay out \$30,000,000 of State funds for good roads. It is not only profitable to the man in the country, but it is also profitable to the man who lives in the city. Baltimore, which pays a large proportion of the entire taxes of the State, has always advocated improved highways. Our city friends find it extremely profitable, as does the man who lives in the country.

When I was a boy, living 6 miles south of the city of Baltimore, I was compelled many times to go in a cart to the city on Monday mornings to attend school, because the roads were so bad that a buggy or a wagon could not get over them. It took two mules to this cart to get us to the city, with the mud up to the hubs. To-day you can speed in an automobile to the city of Baltimore in 15 or 18 minutes. Let some one who is qualified to answer say what that is worth to the farmer and to the city man to get goods transported in the wintertime as well as in the summer. Good roads and improved farm machinery has largely taken the sting out of agricultural work. Keep up the good work and keep the boy and girl on the farm.

Traveling in France, as some of you have done, has enabled me to know the meaning of a system of good roads. One of the things that enabled the allies and our Nation to win this war is the splendid system of good roads that prevails throughout France. What would have happened at Chateau-Thierry and Belleau Woods but for good roads. Here we are talking about \$200,000,000, to be spread over three years, and some gentlemen question whether it is good policy. We should do the same thing in regard to the country that we do in regard to our own individual business; we should do with regard to the community what an individual does with regard to his own interests. If a man wants his business to be profitable he will put his money into such things as will enable the machinery of his business to be run easily and economically, and if we want to build up the business and farming interests of this country we must construct good roads and have good roads and good streets where they can be obtained.

In 1904 I was a member of the House of Delegates of Maryland, when the first bill was introduced appropriating \$100,000 toward the construction of the present boulevard between Baltimore and Washington. I advocated this appropriation and voted for it, and it was the first money which the State of Maryland put into good roads. [Applause.]

The experiment proved so valuable that at the very next administration, in 1908, a complete system of State highways was laid down by the road commission, and from that time until now we have been appropriating and building good roads throughout our State.

As I have said, the roads have cost in the neighborhood of \$30,000,000, and I do not believe you can find a score of people in the whole State who believe the policy to be unwise. If a little Commonwealth like Maryland, of less than one and one-half million people, can expend \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000 upon its highways, what does \$200,000,000 amount to throughout the whole United States when divided into three payments of \$50,000,000 the first year and \$75,000,000 during each of the two succeeding years?

It ought to be a pleasure for this House to vote for a measure of reconstruction such as this after having gone through the vast appropriations for carrying on the war in Europe. France and its allies won the war largely through the operation of trucks and cannon over the splendid highways of that Republic.

Not only are they so immensely valuable in time of war, but throughout all the years they have been the most profitable investment of the Government and assisted business and made pleasure.

I hope the league of nations, which we will no doubt form, will prevent any wars in the future; but then, these highways which we are to construct will be of wonderful service to all our people, and if by chance another war should come they will be of wonderful advantage in connection with that.

The highways of Maryland have been most valuable to the National Government during the war. They have served as a means of transportation when the railroads and other transportation facilities fell down. All the countries of Europe have seen the wisdom of splendid highways for many years. Even the Roman Empire in the height of its glory saw the wisdom of such construction.

I hope that we may be able in the near future to lessen the appropriations for Army and Navy by virtue of the league of nations, and that we may begin internal improvements upon a larger scale than heretofore. The Government is calling upon individuals, States, and cities to speed up on construction. Why should not the National Government do the same? Why should we not have more roads giving employment to labor rather than the construction of temporary buildings, which will be useless within the near future, and which will largely be completed for the purpose of giving employment?

The automobile has broken down the State barrier, and great trunk lines of good roads are demanded. There ought to be a trunk line leading from the Atlantic to the Pacific of one of the best highways in the country. There ought to be others leading from the South to the North and from the Capital to



the various important sections of our land. This would not only give employment to labor but would enhance the value of property, reduce the cost of transportation, and induce more people to take to the farms and the life of production in the country instead of living in the crowded cities, where they are now largely congregated. Every inducement ought to be offered to have the people live in those localities where they can benefit by the sunshine and fresh air and thereby improve the health of the entire people.

As I said at the beginning, I am from a city which will get benefit from this expenditure only incidentally and from a State whose highways are largely completed; nevertheless I think there is no better way for the United States to spend its money than in the construction of good roads. It gives employment, improves the business, and grants pleasure. It solidifies the land and improves health. Let us have more good roads.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, being a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, I have followed with considerable interest the conference report on this bill and have listened to some of the criticism on the part of some of the Members of the House as to the agreement of the conferees on Senate amendment No. 71, which provides an appropriation of \$200,000,000 to aid the States in the construction of improved highways under the act of July 11, 1916, the appropriation to be divided as follows: Fifty million dollars for this fiscal year, \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1920, and \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1921. I think that the conferees would have been subject to just criticism if they had not agreed to that amendment. I do not know of anything that has contributed more to the rapid building of improved highways in the United States than the good-roads bill that we passed in July, 1916, and to my mind the reasons for further activities of that kind are much greater to-day than they were in 1916, when we set the precedent by passing that law. A very wise and helpful precedent, I think it was, of a proper cooperation between the National and State Governments.

Now, some gentlemen undertake to argue that a bill of this kind is contrary to democratic principles in that it imposes upon the National Government an activity which it was never intended that it should assume. When I remember that the greatest of all Democrats, and the most profound statesman that America has produced, Thomas Jefferson, was an advocate of the building of national highways, I have no fear of being criticized as having abandoned democratic principles when I advocate a bill of this kind. A measure of this sort does not in any sense relieve the States and their several subdivisions of their duty and responsibility in the matter of building improved highways, but simply supplements their good work and gives intelligent and helpful assistance and, most important of all, a lively stimulus. It was never intended to relieve the States of any of their responsibility. Those who have studied the improved-highway situation as it has been affected by the good-roads act which we passed July 11, 1916, are bound to be impressed with the thought that the following good results have been obtained by reason of the enactment of that legislation:

First. State laws have been enacted providing effective State control of a large measure of road work, making funds available to meet the Federal appropriations, systematizing the work so that there might be definite and correlated results instead of haphazard construction.

Second. By means of the rules and regulations put into force and effect by the Department of Public Roads and Rural Engineering of the Department of Agriculture a standardization of form and arrangement for highway plans and specifications has been obtained. This will in time be very helpful and beneficial not only to the Federal Government but also to the States by way of encouraging simplicity and standardization in the matter of building good roads.

The citing of the good results following the passage of the act of July 11, 1916, could be extended to cover many more matters of interest, but time forbids now. I shall certainly vote for the adoption of the conference report. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. And I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Two gentlemen from Virginia make the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD, as does the gentleman from Arkansas. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to recommit the bill. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves to recommit the bill H. R. 13308, with instructions to the managers on the part of the House not to agree to Senate amendment 71.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question being taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) there were—ayes 41, noes 101.

Mr. CANNON. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 70, nays 267, answered "present" 4, not voting 88, as follows:

## YEAS—70.

Bacharach	Garrett, Tenn.	Lehlbach	Rowe
Browning	Glynn	Longworth	Sanford
Cannon	Good	McAndrews	Scott, Iowa
Cramton	Gordon	McKinley	Sherley
Curry, Cal.	Gould	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sherwood
Dallinger	Graham, Pa.	Magee	Snyder
Darrow	Green, Iowa	Mann	Snell
Dempsey	Haskell	Mondell	Snyder
Drukker	Haugen	Moore, Ind.	Tilson
Dunn	Hicks	Mott	Tinkham
Eagan	Humphreys	Paige	Treadway
Elston	Husted	Parker, N. J.	Venable
Fairchild, G. W.	Hutchinson	Parker, N. Y.	Walsh
Foss	James	Phelan	Ward
Fuller, Mass.	Kelly, Pa.	Platt	Winslow
Gallagher	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey, J. W.	Woods, Iowa
Gallivan	Kraus	Ramsey	
Garland	LaGuardia	Rogers	

## NAYS—267.

Alexander	Cary	Dyer	Hardy
Almon	Chandler, Okla.	Eagle	Harrison, Miss.
Anthony	Clark, Fla.	Edmonds	Harrison, Va.
Ashbrook	Clark, Pa.	Elliott	Hastings
Aswell	Classon	Ellsworth	Hawley
Austin	Claypool	Esch	Hayden
Ayres	Cleary	Essen	Heaton
Baer	Coady	Evans	Hefner
Bankhead	Collier	Fairchild, B. L.	Hersey
Barkley	Connally, Tex.	Ferris	Hilliard
Beakes	Connolly, Kans.	Fess	Holland
Beshlin	Cooper, Ohio	Fields	Hollingsworth
Birch	Cooper, Wis.	Fisher	Hood
Black	Crosser	Flood	Houston
Blackmon	Currie, Mich.	Focht	Howard
Bland, Ind.	Dale	Fordney	Huddleston
Bland, Va.	Davey	Foster	Hull, Iowa
Blanton	Decker	Frear	Hull, Tenn.
Bowers	Denison	French	Igoe
Brand	Dent	Fuller, Ill.	Ireland
Brodbeck	Denton	Gandy	Jacoway
Browne	Dewalt	Gard	Johnson, Ky.
Buchanan	Dickinson	Garner	Johnson, S. Dak.
Burnett	Dill	Garrett, Tex.	Jones
Butler	Dillon	Goodwin, Ark.	Juhl
Byrnes, S. C.	Dixon	Graham, Ill.	Kearns
Byrns, Tenn.	Dominick	Gray, Ala.	Keating
Campbell, Kans.	Donovan	Greene, Mass.	Kehoe
Campbell, Pa.	Dooling	Greene, Vt.	Kettner
Candler, Miss.	Doolittle	Gregg	Key, Ohio
Caraway	Doremus	Griest	Kless, Pa.
Carroll	Doughton	Griffin	Kincheloe
Carew	Dowell	Hadley	King
Carlin	Drane	Hamilton, Mich.	Kinkaid
Carter, Okla.	Dupré	Hamlin	Knutson



Kreider	Montague	Rose	Sumners
La Follette	Moon	Rouse	Sweet
Lampert	Morgan	Rubey	Taylor, Colo.
Larsen	Morin	Rucker	Temple
Lazaro	Mudd	Sabath	Thompson
Lea, Cal.	Neely	Sanders, Ind.	Tillman
Lee, Ga.	Nelson, A. P.	Sanders, La.	Timberlake
Leshner	Nelson, J. M.	Saunders, Va.	Towner
Lever	Nichols, Mich.	Schall	Vestal
Linthicum	Oliver, Ala.	Scott, Mich.	Vinson
Little	Oliver, N. Y.	Scully	Voigt
Lobeck	Osborne	Sells	Volstead
London	Overstreet	Shouse	Walton
Loneragan	Padgett	Siegel	Watkins
Lundeen	Polk	Sims	Watson, Pa.
Lunn	Pou	Sinnott	Watson, Va.
McArthur	Powers	Sisson	Weaver
McCormick	Purnell	Slomp	Welling
McCulloch	Quin	Sloan	Welty
McFadden	Ragsdale	Small	Whaley
McKenzie	Rainey, H. T.	Smith, Idaho	White, Me.
McKeown	Raker	Smith, Mich.	Wilson, La.
McLaughlin, Mich.	Ramseyer	Snook	Wilson, Tex.
McLemore	Randall	Stegall	Wingo
Madden	Rankin	Stedman	Wise
Mansfield	Rayburn	Steele	Wood, Ind.
Mapes	Reavis	Steenerson	Woodyard
Martin	Reed	Stephens, Miss.	Wright
Mason	Roberts	Stephens, Nebr.	Young, N. Dak.
Mays	Robinson	Stiness	Young, Tex.
Merritt	Rodenberg	Strong	Zihlman
Miller, Wash.	Romjue	Sullivan	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Cooper, W. Va.	Emerson	Moore, Pa.	Riordan
----------------	---------	------------	---------

## NOT VOTING—88.

Anderson	Farr	McClintic	Stafford
Barnhart	Flynn	Maher	Sterling
Bell	Francis	Miller, Minn.	Stevenson
Benson	Freeman	Nicholls, S. C.	Swift
Booher	Gillett	Nolan	Switzer
Borland	Godwin, N. C.	Norton	Tague
Britten	Goodall	Oldfield	Taylor, Ark.
Brumbaugh	Gray, N. J.	Olney	Templeton
Burroughs	Hamill	O'Shaunessy	Thomas
Caldwell	Hamilton, N. Y.	Overmyer	Van Dyke
Carter, Mass.	Hayes	Park	Vare
Chandler, N. Y.	Helntz	Peters	Waldow
Church	Helm	Porter	Walker
Copley	Helvering	Pratt	Wason
Costello	Hensley	Price	Webb
Cox	Johnson, Wash.	Rowland	Wheeler
Crago	Kahn	Russell	White, Ohio
Crisp	Kelley, Mich.	Sanders, N. Y.	Williams
Davis	Kennedy, R. I.	Sears	Wilson, Ill.
Delaney	Kitchin	Shackleford	
Dies	Langley	Shallenberger	
Estopinal	Littlepage	Smith, C. B.	
Fairfield	Lufkin	Smith, T. F.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:  
Until further notice:

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. LUFKIN.  
Mr. STEVENSON with Mr. JOHNSON of Washington.  
Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. COSTELLO.  
Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. COOPER of West Virginia.  
Mr. HAMILL with Mr. GOODALL.  
Mr. SHALLENBERGER with Mr. FAIRFIELD.  
Mr. WHITE of Ohio with Mr. NORTON.  
Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. EMERSON.  
Mr. BARNHART with Mr. BURROUGHS.  
Mr. BENSON with Mr. COPLEY.  
Mr. BOOHER with Mr. CRAGO.  
Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. DAVIS.  
Mr. CRISP with Mr. FREEMAN.  
Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. KAHN.  
Mr. HELM with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.  
Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.  
Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. NOLAN.  
Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. PETERS.  
Mr. MAHER with Mr. PORTER.  
Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. SANDERS of New York.  
Mr. OLDFIELD with Mr. SWIFT.  
Mr. OLNEY with Mr. SWITZER.  
Mr. PARK with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.  
Mr. SEARS with Mr. WASON.  
Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. WILLIAMS.  
Mr. WEBB with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.

On this vote:

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. BELL (against).  
Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea," but I find I am paired with the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. BELL, and I request that my vote be changed to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## FILLING VACANCY IN BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution 195.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution 195.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 195) providing for the filling of a proximate vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur on February 6, 1919, by reason of the expiration of the term of George Gray, of Delaware, be filled by the reappointment of the said George Gray for the ensuing term.

Mr. MANN. I do not object, but I want to offer an amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, in line 5, by striking out the words "will occur" and insert in lieu thereof the word "occurred."

Mr. PADGETT. That is proper.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended by striking out the word "proximate."

On motion of Mr. PADGETT, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

## RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the river and harbor bill, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the river and harbor bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I think we had better have the Senate amendments printed first.

Mr. SMALL. The Printing Office reports that they are very busy and can not have them printed before to-morrow morning. There will be no meeting of the conferees before to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. Then there is no reason for sending it to conference to-day.

Mr. SMALL. Except that we want to know who the conferees are, so that they may be studying the Senate amendments.

Mr. MANN. Some other Members want to study the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman insist on his request?

Mr. SMALL. I prefer to insist upon it, but if the gentleman is insistent—

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman insists on his request and refuses to let it be printed, I will object now and hereafter.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

## PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up conference report on the bill H. R. 12211.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12211) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War and to widows of such soldiers and sailors having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, and 27.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 17, 22, 25, 26, and 28, and agree to the same.

JOHN A. KEY,  
SAM R. SELLS,

Managers on the part of the House.

T. J. WALSH,  
REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.



The statement is as follows:

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12211) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependents of such soldiers and sailors, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference as to each of said amendments, viz:

On amendment No. 1 (Sarah B. Greene): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 2 (Edward Blackmer): A correction.

On amendment No. 3 (Annie Neate): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 4 (Fred A. Angelo): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 5 (Samuel E. Spencer): Grants \$17 a month in lieu of \$12.

On amendment No. 6 (Edith V. Bowman): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 7 (Grant H. Hill): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 8 (Lindley Herrington): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 9 (Genevra M. Lamb): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 10 (Charles A. Walters): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 11 (Edward P. Aler, alias John P. Edwards): A correction.

On amendment No. 12 (Emma L. Green): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 13 (James P. Dooley): A correction.

On amendment No. 14 (Frances L. Young): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 15 (Fred F. Newell): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 16 (Susan E. Brown): Restores rate of \$25 in lieu of \$20 proposed.

On amendment No. 17 (Henry A. Jaegle): Grants rate of \$17 a month in lieu of \$12 proposed.

On amendment No. 18 (Mary A. Lawson): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 19 (Mary O. Barbee): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 20 (Carrie E. Dennis): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 21 (Lafayette Martin): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 22 (Walter Sewell): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 23 (Addie Burns): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 24 (Mary E. Wainright): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 25 (Rebecca Strouther): Strikes out provision for increase of pension, as she is now pensioned under special act of Congress.

On amendment No. 26 (Belle R. Reid): Strikes out provision for increase of pension, as she is now pensioned under special act of Congress.

On amendment No. 27 (Alice A. Thorburn): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 28 (Wesley H. Crockett): Strikes out provision for pension.

JOHN A. KEY,  
SAM R. SELLS,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 4723.

The Clerk read the conference report.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1072).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4723) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 3, 4, 9, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"The name of Robert J. Erwin, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

And the House agree to the same.

JOHN A. KEY,  
SAM R. SELLS,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

T. J. WALSH,  
REED SMOOT,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4723) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of said amendments, namely:

On No. 1: Provides a pension of \$50 per month for the widow of Maj. Gen. Albert L. Mills, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 2: Provides a pension of \$50 per month for the widow of Rear Admiral Vincendon L. Cottman, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 3: Strikes out, as proposed by the House, the provision for increase of pension for David A. Kooker.

On No. 4: Strikes out, as proposed by the House, the provision for pension for James W. Wilson.

On No. 5: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, pension for Mark M. Coffman.

On No. 6: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, increase of pension for Martha E. Hammond.

On No. 7: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, pension for Louise R. Hanley.

On No. 8: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, pension for Belle H. Purdon.

On No. 9: Strikes out, as proposed by the House, the provision for pension to John Bernard Rueben, alias Bernard Reuben.

On No. 10: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, a pension of \$50 for the widow of Brig. Gen. Palmer G. Wood.

On No. 11: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, pension for Amy B. Mitchell.

On No. 12: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, increase of pension for Louis Miller.

On No. 13: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, increase of pension for Dora L. Brown.

On No. 14: Provides increase of pension to \$17 per month for Robert J. Erwin instead of \$24 as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 15: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, increase of pension for Julia Carey.

JOHN A. KING,  
SAM R. SELLS,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The conference report was agreed to.

#### FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15979, making appropriations for fortifications.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15979, the fortifications appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman from Iowa if we can not agree upon some time for general debate?

Mr. GOOD. How much time does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. About an hour on a side.

Mr. GOOD. I have a request for over three hours on this side.



Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman realizes, I think, that, if possible, we want to finish this bill to-day. I hope that gentlemen can cut that down. There will be other appropriation bills to follow this.

Mr. GOOD. Not very many, and these gentlemen are very anxious to address the House. I am anxious to do all I can to expedite the bill. Will not the gentleman give us three hours and a half for general debate?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Can not the gentleman make it three hours, and that will take us until 6 o'clock?

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield some of his time to this side?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I would not care to promise, because I have a number of requests from gentlemen on this side, but I may be able to yield some of my time. I do not want to be bound by any promise, however.

Mr. GOOD. Well, we will try to get along with that understanding.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, pending the motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the pending bill be limited to three hours, one-half to be controlled by myself and one-half by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion, the gentleman from Tennessee asks that general debate be limited to three hours, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good]. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall reserve the right to object in order to get some information, if I may be permitted to do so. Three hours of general debate will run until about half past 6 o'clock, I take it. It will not take very long to pass the bill under the five-minute rule, for I imagine there are not very many controverted items in it. Is it the intention, then, to keep on this evening and take up the railroad deficiency bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not answer the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. I think we would better find out. I think Members of the House would like to know. Then I would like to know what we are going to do to-morrow and Thursday and Friday. Is it the intention to bring in the wheat bill for consideration, and, if so, when?

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I think we will try to finish this bill to-day.

Mr. MANN. Ah, that is too easy. We could do that and have seven hours of general debate.

Mr. KITCHIN. To-day?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. And then to-morrow we will take up the railroad bill.

Mr. MANN. I thought probably we would go ahead with the railroad bill to-night. That is what I would do if I were running the House.

Mr. KITCHIN. And the wheat bill Friday, and by that time we hope the sundry civil bill will be reported—by Friday, so that we can begin its consideration on Saturday.

Mr. MANN. If they have good luck, they may get the sundry civil bill in on Friday.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. I would say this bill to-day, the railroad bill to-morrow, the wheat bill Friday, and then begin the sundry civil appropriation bill on Saturday morning.

Mr. MANN. No rule is required for the railroad bill, but I take it that the Committee on Rules would report a rule for the wheat bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from North Carolina will ask unanimous consent that the wheat bill may be in order for consideration under the general rules of the House. Otherwise we will have to go through the form of reporting a rule.

Mr. WALSH. On Friday?

Mr. RAYBURN. To follow the railroad bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. To be in order as a privileged bill.

Mr. MANN. We want to know when it is coming up. Will it be in order to take it up following the railroad bill? Of course, it would not have to come up under such conditions.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill known as the wheat bill shall be in order after the disposition of the railroad deficiency bill. We will not take it up until Friday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the wheat bill shall be in order after the railroad bill, under the general rules of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee that general debate upon the pending bill shall not exceed three hours, half of that time to be con-

trolled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the fortifications appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the fortifications appropriation bill, with Mr. CLARK of Florida in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the fortification bill carries items for the seacoast defenses of continental United States, the insular possessions and Panama, and also for mobile artillery and artillery ammunition for the armies of the United States. In addition to that, this bill carries appropriations for the barracks and quarters for continental United States, the insular possessions and Panama, items which have heretofore been carried in the sundry civil appropriation bill, and which for the first time are carried in the bill now pending.

The seacoast defenses of the United States, the Panama Canal, and the insular possessions have been carried forward from time to time under the reported projects of various boards of the War Department. The first comprehensive scheme of coast defenses was based upon the so-called Endicott board. This was revised by the Taft board, and that in turn was revised by the board of review as late as November, 1915. The report of the board of review called for the expenditure of approximately \$100,000,000 for additions, alterations, and modifications of existing defenses and the initiation of defenses at new points. All of the schemes of coast defense up to and including the original board of review report were based upon the installation of fixed armament. A subsequent modification of the board of review project by the War Department provided for the procurement of a limited number of heavy guns mounted upon railway carriages to supplement the fixed fortifications at a point of attack. The development of the use of and the procurement of heavy railway artillery in the present war has brought some confusion into the future scheme of coast defenses. So far as fixed fortifications are concerned the better military opinion is to provide for coast defenses mainly by use of heavy railway mounted guns and guns mounted upon tractors.

The board of review project has never been fully appropriated for or carried out. No estimates were submitted this year for the manufacture of the armament remaining to be installed, the whole question of further fixed fortifications and railway mounts being reserved for further study and recommendation by the War Department. The United States has on hand now a very considerable number of heavy guns mounted upon railway cars, and additional guns are under manufacture.

It is the belief of the committee that in view of the very great change which has come in the use of heavy railway and tractor mounted guns that a careful survey of our entire coast-defense system must be made and a policy determined upon.

The estimates for seacoast cannon and armament in connection with this bill have been practically eliminated. The War Department in most instances has large balances on hand unallotted and unobligated which can be used economically and slowly in arriving at a policy of coast defense. No considerable expenditure should be made until a determination of correct policy has been arrived at.

The estimates upon which the bill is based have been very greatly modified since they were first prepared. As originally prepared before the signing of the armistice, the estimates call for \$645,576,961.01. After the signing of the armistice the War Department made an arbitrary cut in the estimates of 90 per cent, and since that cut was made further reductions were made. In addition thereto a number of supplementary estimates were submitted. The total revised estimates upon which the bill is based call for \$92,893,657.71. The committee, after a very careful consideration and a hearing of some length, has reported a bill which carries \$11,199,291. Of this sum it may be said that \$4,161,849 is for the construction of permanent barracks and quarters for the Panama Canal, \$225,000 for barracks and quarters in the Hawaiian Islands, and \$40,000 for certain improvements in barracks here in continental United States.



If these sums be eliminated, the remainder of the bill is \$6,764,442, a little more than the amount of the fortification bill prior to the embarkation of the Government upon the board of review projects for the enlargement of the coast defenses.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. TILSON. There was some confusion a few minutes ago and I do not know that I understood the gentleman correctly, but I did understand him to say that nothing is to be appropriated for the construction of large semimobile guns, guns to be installed on railway carriages or to be driven by tractors.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is correct. There was no estimate submitted to the committee for the construction of heavy guns, with the exception of an estimate for an 18-inch gun, which was intended to be constructed for experimental purposes.

Mr. TILSON. Does not the gentleman think that in view of the large part which these very large semimobile guns played in the present war in Europe that we ought to at least go on with the development of something along that line?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will state to the gentleman that there are now in process of construction eight 16-inch rifles and also twenty-five 14-inch guns which are not provided with mounts. In addition thereto, the project of installing thirty-six 12-inch guns mounted on Barbette carriages will soon be completed. There have also been acquired six 50-caliber 12-inch guns which were originally manufactured for the Chilean Government, and there will also be acquired thirteen 14-inch guns on railroad mounts.

Mr. TILSON. There are sufficient funds to go forward with their manufacture?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There are sufficient funds to complete those guns; but, to be entirely frank with the gentleman, I will say that the department estimated for 25 railway-mount carriages for these 14-inch guns to which I have referred, and the committee makes no recommendation of an appropriation for that purpose. These railroad carriages can be constructed, of course, much quicker than the guns can be forged and machined. In addition thereto, it was stated to the committee that so much has been learned from our experience in the war and the experience of our allies that there is more than likely to be a great development and improvement in the construction of railway mounts and also with reference to the use of tractors for guns.

Mr. TILSON. That is, so far as there has been a pause it is only to wait until we can get authentic up-to-date information together and then decide upon a final and permanent plan for these large guns?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is entirely correct, and the department has in its hands a sufficient amount of money to carry out the present project. And I will say to the gentleman and the committee that the sum of \$11,000,000 carried in this bill is not the only money which will be spent, in all probability, during the coming year. The department, as I have stated, has now a very large sum on hand unallotted and unobligated, and the committee believes that after settling the obligations now existing that it will be able to save quite a considerable sum of money out of which to carry forward and take care of the experimental and development work now under consideration, and also to do such salvage of ordnance and ammunition as is necessary.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman state, approximately, how much of the money that has been appropriated heretofore and not expended will be available in addition to what will be carried in this bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. For field-artillery purposes alone there are now available appropriations aggregating \$2,290,209,905.18. That sum is to be held for the settlement of outstanding obligations and allotments aggregating \$2,182,946,813.52, on the basis of paying 75 per cent of their face value, and for the settlement of outstanding reservations created, \$4,353,331,966.13, on a basis of 15 per cent of their estimated cost. The gentleman will remember that those were the percentages which were used in the deficiency bill, or the covering-in bill, which was passed by the House and Senate some days ago, and the committee, as I stated before, thought that was a very liberal percentage, especially with reference to the reservation of appropriations which have been made and which were entirely unallotted and unobligated. The question was asked of those appearing before the committee whether or not they would not be able to save enough money out of the money on hand to carry forward these various experiments and development processes thought necessary, and also to make proper salvage of ordnance and ammuni-

tion, and, while they insisted they ought to have the appropriation, none were willing to deny that they would not be able to save enough money to—

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman a question which I think is vital and fundamental. I have been reading very carefully the constitution of the league of nations, which, I understand, is to make all future wars impossible. If that be the fact, what is the need of any fortifications at all?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, I do not think that the time will ever come when this country can afford entirely to abandon its coast defenses, and I will say this to the gentleman—

Mr. SHERWOOD. Then the gentleman would abandon the league of nations?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I certainly would not do that. This bill does not undertake to make any appropriations for additional work. It is only to carry out projects which are now under way and, in many instances, very nearly completed.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Well, the appropriations originally were useless. None of these coast defenses have ever fired a gun and never will be called upon to fire a gun.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That may be true, I will say to the gentleman; but that in itself does not prove the want of necessity of having coast defenses.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I understood the war was to make the world safe for democracy. If it is made safe for democracy, what do we need of fortifications?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, I do not care, of course, to enter into any lengthy discussion upon that particular proposition, but I will say to the gentleman that I think the time is far distant when we will not need substantial coast defenses as a measure of safety and protection against possible attack.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But I will admit that it would be a most happy result—

Mr. SHERWOOD. Then let us aim at it. If that is a happy result, let us aim at it then.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. As long as we make appropriations for a Navy as we have done, as long as we make appropriations for a considerable Army, I take it we ought to have appropriations for keeping up our coast defenses.

Mr. DENISON. Do I understand the gentleman from Tennessee to state that this bill carries no provision for any additional coast defenses, but is simply a continuation of what has heretofore been provided for?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This bill simply carries appropriations to continue work now under construction. I will say to the gentleman there was no estimate submitted, no request made, to the Committee on Appropriations for what might be called new projects in continental United States. There was an estimate for the purchase of some land in the island of Oahu, in Hawaii. But that was not allowed.

Mr. DENISON. Are there under contemplation no further increments of defense of the Panama Canal?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, yes.

Mr. DENISON. Does that bill carry any such provision for any additional coast defense at the Panama Canal?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This bill carries no provision for coast defense at the Panama Canal. There is an appropriation in the bill for the clearings and trails and for barracks and quarters in Panama. But I will say to the gentleman that the officials of the War Department are of the opinion that in view of the fact that we have just passed through a great war and that there are many lessons to be digested as the result of that war, in view of the fact that there was at the time of the signing of the armistice a great development taking place in the way of improving our mobile artillery, our guns and their mounts, that there ought to be time given to enable the proper board to study the proposition and to make necessary experiments in order to determine just what is the most up-to-date form of armament before we make any very heavy further expenditures in the way of providing new coast defenses.

Mr. DENISON. The department has made no estimate, then, for any increase or improvement of the defenses of the canal?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not want the gentleman to misunderstand me. There was a considerable estimate for aerial stations on the Panama Canal that I was about to overlook.

Mr. DENISON. It was stated on the floor of the House, I think, last week, by a Member of the House, and, I think, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who had been in Europe during this war, that the canal could not be defended for one day against an enemy. Does the gentleman think that statement was wrong or is there some foundation for it?



Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They have now, of course, considerable defenses in the way of fortifications on the Panama Canal. Some considerable money has been spent there. An appropriation was made last year for the purchase of land on an island near the Canal Zone, in order to provide for additional fortifications on the Pacific side.

Mr. DENISON. Has that island been purchased?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It has not. A commission has been appointed, consisting of certain Panamanians and officials of our Government. They have had the matter under consideration. They have not yet been able to agree upon the acquisition of the land and no action has been taken for that reason. But they have the money.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman know what island that is?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The island of Taboga.

Mr. DENISON. A question in reference to the statement the gentleman made awhile ago; I understood him to say there was an amount appropriated for permanent barracks at Panama.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is an amount slightly over \$4,000,000 carried in this bill for permanent barracks and quarters at Panama.

Mr. DENISON. What is the purpose of that appropriation?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. To provide barracks and quarters for two regiments on the Canal Zone and also barracks and quarters for two companies of Coast Artillery, 150 men each, at Fort Sherman, which, as the gentleman will recall, is near the mouth of the Chagres River. There is a battery now in the course of construction, not yet completed, at the mouth of the Chagres River, which is known as Fort Sherman. There is no place there in which to house the men who will man that battery, and this bill carries \$150,000 for the purpose of constructing barracks and quarters for 300 men. And in addition to that, as I have stated, there is a recommendation for \$3,900,000, in round numbers, for two regiments to be located on the canal. I will say to the gentleman that an estimate was submitted last year, and resubmitted this year, that called for \$13,000,000 for barracks and quarters for six regiments, two regiments of Infantry, to be located at the Gatun lock and dam, and two regiments of Infantry at Miraflores, and two regiments, one of Cavalry and one of Artillery, at Corozal. The committee did not allow the full estimate, but did allow sufficient money for barracks and quarters for two regiments, believing that was all that could be efficiently done this year.

Mr. DENISON. Where are the barracks to be located that are called for in this bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That was not determined. It was the idea to have barracks and quarters at the three places I have named. The committee has left it entirely with the War Department as to whether they will put them at one place or the other. We simply make provision for barracks and quarters for two regiments.

I will state, Mr. Chairman, in connection with what I have said concerning the amount of money carried in this bill by way of appropriation, that the committee has recommended a provision covering back into the Treasury \$1,819,000. Therefore it should be noted that while this bill carries appropriations aggregating \$11,199,291, it repeals appropriations heretofore made aggregating \$1,819,000, so that the net charge upon the Treasury by this bill is \$9,380,291.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will not make the point of no quorum unless the gentleman thinks he wants it. I think this is an important debate, and this bill is against the whole policy of the administration and against the high ideals of the President. I think we should not change the policy of the administration unless more gentlemen are here. I will not make the point, however, unless the gentleman wishes me to do it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will not do that. There are quite a number of Members present now, but I would like to see a larger attendance here in the discussion of the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. SHERWOOD. You are making an important speech.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. Does this bill provide a much greater appropriation than the bills heretofore?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No.

Mr. LONDON. It does not increase the amount over them?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This bill is a very few dollars more than the appropriations made for fortifications prior to our entrance into the war. The gentleman will remember that up until 1917, the year in which we entered the war, there was never appropriated for the purposes carried in this bill more

than \$9,316,000, and in nearly every instance it was \$4,000,000, \$5,000,000, or \$6,000,000.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. I was just going to ask that question as to the years from 1913 up to 1919. Will the gentleman put those figures in, please?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. In 1913 the amount carried by the bill was something over \$4,000,000. In 1914 the appropriation was \$5,218,250; then an additional amount of \$31,000 was carried in a joint resolution for a site at Cape Henry. Then in 1915 the appropriation was \$5,627,700. In 1916 the appropriation was \$6,060,216.90, while in 1917 the appropriation was \$25,747,550. The gentleman will remember that a great deal of that appropriation was required for some extra fortification purposes in the Panama Canal, and that it was made in pursuance of the revised plans of the board of review.

Mr. SNYDER. I remember that distinctly. But I just wanted to point out the fact that now, in the face of a league of nations and a world's peace, we are asking three times as much for fortifications as we did in 1913.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No.

Mr. SNYDER. Practically three times as much.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; the gentleman is entirely mistaken. This bill, it is true, carries \$11,191,000, but of that amount more than \$4,000,000 is for barracks and quarters in this country and also in Panama and in the insular possessions. As a matter of fact, that portion of this bill which the gentleman can justly compare with the bill that was passed in 1913 amounts to only \$6,764,442.

Mr. SNYDER. That is the fact that I wanted to bring out.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will see that it is very little larger and in some cases less than what was carried in some of those years. As I have said, this bill carries no appropriation for new defenses or additional armament.

Mr. LONDON. How much of that \$25,000,000 appropriated for 1917 has been expended?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think practically all of it. It is impossible for me to answer that question, because these are continuing appropriations, but practically very nearly all of that money has been expended on projects now in course of completion.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. In order to make the gentleman's statement complete, should he not refer to the fact that in the fortifications bill and other bills during the year 1919 there were over \$5,000,000,000 appropriated or authorized for the most important item of this entire bill, which is mountain, field, and siege cannon, the acquisition of ammunition, and so on? The gentleman does not carry a single cent in this bill for any of those objects, for the reason that we have on hand already, or in process of manufacture and nearing completion, a large supply of the most important things needed for our Military Establishment, which have been provided for under the appropriations for 1919. Is not that a fair statement?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. I am obliged to the gentleman for the statement. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. How many troops has this Government in Panama now, and how many has it been maintaining there heretofore?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The estimates submitted to the committee call for barracks and quarters for about 10,000 men.

Mr. DENISON. In this bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In this bill. But the committee has submitted a recommendation only for barracks and quarters which will house approximately 4,000 men. There have been down there, according to my recollection, about eight or nine thousand men, but it has been stated that the commanding officer has requested permission to withdraw the greater portion of those troops on account of the fact that there are no decent quarters for them to live in. He says there is no place for them to live in a decent manner.

Mr. DENISON. How have they been housed?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They have been living in old wooden buildings, some of them constructed by the French at the time the French Panama Canal Co. was trying to dig the canal. These buildings are old. Last year \$500,000 was appropriated by Congress to repair some of those buildings. As a matter of fact only \$275,000 of the amount was expended. The commanding general reported to the War Department that he



would not spend the \$225,000 remaining for repairs because it was merely throwing good money after bad, and that the buildings were not worth repairing.

Mr. DENISON. So that there is need of permanent barracks?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am convinced in my own mind that if we are to keep troops in Panama, they need barracks and quarters. For my part I think when private soldiers are required to stay there for a year or two they ought to be given decent and proper housing.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman give the name of this officer who refused to waste the money in that way? I think he ought to be commended and given a medal of some kind.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Gen. Blatchford.

Mr. DENISON. He ought to be commended.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I used?

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty-five minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I must hurry along.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Section 7 of the bill, it seems to me, is one of the most suggestive and interesting provisions. The law of 1916 provided for appropriating \$417,000 to procure one radio-dynamic torpedo unit, and provided also, did it not, for the purchase by the United States, and the transfer by John Hays Hammond, jr., to the United States of all the patent rights of Hammond?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, this pending bill amends that, so as to appropriate \$400,000 and get one radio-dynamic unit to control torpedoes, but not to get the patent rights of Hammond. That is a very different thing.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that the situation is just this: The law of 1916, to which the gentleman refers, appropriated \$30,000 to be used in making certain tests by a board to be appointed by the President and composed of Army and naval officers. And it provided that upon their approval and recommendation \$750,000 should be paid to Mr. Hammond for the acquisition of the entire patent rights of his radiodynamic torpedo, and that after acquiring all those rights \$417,000 should then be spent in the installation of a unit. Now, since that law was passed, a board of Army and naval officers have conducted a number of trial tests at different times. They state to the committee that they are thoroughly convinced and satisfied that Mr. Hammond has demonstrated that he can control what might be called a water-borne, or surface, craft, or a torpedo on top of the surface, but that they are not entirely prepared to recommend payment of the \$750,000 until they are more clearly satisfied that he can control a torpedo under the water. Some of them expressed the opinion that they thought that Mr. Hammond would be able to demonstrate his ability to control a craft or a torpedo under the water.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. By wireless?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. By wireless or radio. They asked the committee, therefore, to reverse the process and to permit them to spend \$417,000 now in the installation of a unit, so that they can thoroughly test out his invention before recommending the payment of \$750,000 to him; and the committee felt that, owing to the importance of the matter and the large amount of money involved, it was an entirely proper thing to do.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then the gentleman from Tennessee says that the law of 1916 provided for the appropriation of \$417,000 for the procurement and installation of one radio-dynamic torpedo unit, and then provided that no part of that should be expended unless the Government got all the rights of Hammond, and Hammond was to receive \$750,000—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In advance, before the installation of the unit. Now, this is simply turning the thing around, to provide for the installation of the unit and the actual demonstration of his ability to do what he says before paying him for his rights.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If this bill is enacted, will it then still leave the law so that upon the payment of \$750,000 to Hammond he must transfer to the Government all his rights to this invention?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, yes; provided this board of officers under the act of 1916 approve the purchase of his invention.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The reading of the provision in the pending bill rather confused me. I did not understand from reading it that if the Government paid the \$750,000 it would re-

ceive the exclusive rights owned by Hammond. In other words, I did not want it so that \$417,000 would be expended for the procurement of one of these units and still leave the possibility of Hammond retaining the exclusive right to the patents.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; the gentleman will notice that when this \$417,000 is expended this unit shall belong exclusively to the United States, which shall have control of it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then if the board of Army officers are satisfied that this invention does what he says it will do, they will recommend the payment of \$750,000 and therefore acquire all of his rights to the invention.

Mr. DENISON. If they do not recommend it, then the \$417,000 will be lost?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Not altogether lost, because there will be a good deal of salvage.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The language to which I wish to direct the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee is the last proviso, found on line 7, page 12, of the bill:

*Provided further, That no part of said sum shall be expended until the United States shall first receive from John Hays Hammond, jr., and from the Radio Engineering Co. of New York (Inc.) an unconditional license to use without cost said unit and all repairs and replacements thereof, in the event that the United States shall not acquire as heretofore provided the exclusive rights of said John Hays Hammond, jr., and of said Radio Engineering Co.*

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That language refers to the expenditure of the \$417,000 for the installation of the unit, and does not refer to the \$750,000 which will eventually be paid to Mr. Hammond provided he satisfies this board of Army and naval officers.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield further in that connection?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There is an important point there.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. I have not before me the language of the law, but I believe it provided for acquiring the entire rights to this invention. Now, this proposition is to amend the prior language so as "to read as follows"—and then follows the language. What I wish to know is how much of the former language is repealed by this?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No part of the law is repealed except that provision which provided for the installation of the unit and the expenditure of the \$417,000 after the acquisition of the rights of Mr. Hammond. This simply reverses the process. It does not undertake to repeal any portion of the law. It simply undertakes to give authority for the installation of the unit, in order that this test may be made properly, and that the board may be thoroughly convinced before directing the payment of the money.

Mr. MANN. The power, then, to acquire the entire rights of Hammond would still remain on the payment of the \$750,000?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; undoubtedly.

Mr. GOOD. Less the \$30,000 already paid out for tests.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Illinois raises the exact point I had in mind.

Mr. MANN. Without having the language of the original law before me, it strikes me, as it does the gentleman from Wisconsin, to inquire as to how far, if at all, that modified the right of the Government to acquire the entire rights in the invention?

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will yield to me, I think I can explain that.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Before the gentleman makes his explanation, let me make one suggestion. I think it is in the mind of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], too. The proviso of existing law quoted on line 17, page 11, reads:

*Provided, That no part of said sum—*

*That is the \$417,000 to be paid for the unit—*

*shall be so expended unless the United States shall first acquire as heretofore provided the rights of the said John Hays Hammond, jr., and the Radio Engineering Co. of New York.*

Now, that means, does it not, that you shall not expend any part of the \$417,000 for the construction of the radiodynamic unit until by the expenditure of \$750,000 you have first acquired the rights of Mr. Hammond?

Mr. GOOD. Now, let me explain. When the matter first came before the committee the War Department desired to purchase outright these patents, 128 of them, from John Hays Hammond, jr., for about \$1,000,000, and an appropriation of \$417,000 to construct one unit. The committee, after having hearings for more than a week, reported out the bill, which was adopted and became a part of the law, that the War Department had en-



tered into a contract with John Hays Hammond, jr., for the purchase of these patents for \$750,000, of which \$30,000 was to be paid in developing experimental work. The balance should not be paid until the general board appointed by the President should be satisfied that the proposition was a workable one, and the torpedo or boat containing the explosive could be controlled by this process. For the last three years they have been conducting experiments and they have had several before this board.

The matter has developed to such a state that the War Department is satisfied that John Hays Hammond, jr., has done what he promised and more before he came to Congress, but they want to see whether or not one of these torpedoes constructed as he proposes can be controlled and managed just as he can control and has controlled a surface boat, and Mr. Hammond has agreed to give a license to the Government to construct, without any payment to him, one unit that is to cost \$417,000; that the Government shall own the unit, shall have the unconditional right to use it in any way, whether it purchases afterwards the patents or not.

Now, the Government proposes with that money to construct these units, and then if the board, after seeing the completed unit in operation, is satisfied that they can make a report, then the Government will pay Mr. Hammond the balance of the \$750,000?

Mr. MANN. What we want to know is whether, when the Government expends \$417,000 for the purpose of demonstrating whether the patents are any good, the Government is then certain to be able to own the patents.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. On the payment of the \$750,000. Suppose Mr. Hammond does not carry out the contract. He would not get the \$750,000?

Mr. GOOD. No; and an action could be commenced to enforce the specific performance.

Mr. MANN. Of course, if the proposition is demonstrated to work the way it is supposed it will work, it will be worth a good deal to foreign countries to own the patents. But I have no doubt the committee has given full consideration to that proposition. We ought to know for sure that we do not expend \$417,000 to demonstrate that Mr. Hammond has a good patent.

Mr. GOOD. The committee was strongly impressed with the high character displayed by John Hays Hammond, jr. It is his desire to have the Government of the United States own the patents, and we are satisfied that if he had wanted to sell them he could have gone abroad and sold them for a great deal more than twice that provided for here. But he is now willing to give the patents for the unit without any payment at all.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In lines 16 to 21 of the bill, page 11, is a copy of the law of 1916. If this pending bill is enacted into law it will absolutely repeal that, because line 22 says that the language is amended so as "to read as follows." Therefore that provision from the law of 1916 will be repealed and the only law on the book touching that subject will be that remaining on pages 11 and 12, and the proviso on page 12 contemplating that the United States Government may never get the patents.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Let me show the gentleman. Beginning on line 7, page 12—

That no part of said sum shall be expended until the United States shall first receive from John Hays Hammond, jr., and from the Radio Engineering Co. of New York (Inc.), an unconditional license to use without cost said unit and all repairs and replacements thereof, in the event that the United States shall not acquire as heretofore provided the exclusive rights of said John Hays Hammond, jr., and of said Radio Engineering Co.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; but that was simply to enumerate—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The language of the act of 1916 as it appears on page 11 is this:

For procurement and installation of one radiodynamic torpedo unit, \$417,000: *Provided*, That no part of said sum shall be so expended unless the United States shall first acquire as heretofore provided the rights of the said John Hays Hammond, jr., and the Radio Engineering Co. of New York.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. "No part of said sum"; that is, the \$417,000 which is appropriated for the installing of one radiodynamic torpedo unit; but that does not refer to the \$750,000 which was to be paid to Mr. Hammond for the acquisition of all his rights.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. You can not expend under the law of 1916 one cent until you get the patent rights.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true.

Mr. DENISON. That is not correct.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes; it is.

Mr. DENISON. You do not have to have the patent rights, but you have to have the right to go ahead and make the experiment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is, under this proposed bill, but under the act of 1916 no sum could be expended for the installation of a unit until you first acquire the patent rights of Mr. Hammond.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Exactly; I knew that was existing law.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is proposed to permit the establishment of a unit in advance of acquiring his rights.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Exactly.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But it does not in any way interfere with or disturb the law of 1916 in so far as subsequently acquiring all of the rights of Mr. Hammond, providing this board so recommends.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is there anything in the law to show that the United States has a contract with Mr. Hammond or with that engineering company?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They have a contract with him.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is there anything in the law to show that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The law provides for a contract, and there has been a contract entered into between Mr. Hammond and the department officials. I think it is set forth in the hearings.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It seems to me that the law of 1916 is absolutely repealed if we enact this into law.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will examine the law of 1916, I feel sure he will find that he is in error. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the committee will permit me to proceed now for a few minutes more, as I have promised to yield some of my time to certain gentlemen. Estimates were submitted to the committee for the building of certain aerial stations and balloon stations, both in continental United States and in the insular possessions and Panama, calling for quite a number of millions of dollars. The committee has declined to recommend any sum for the construction of aerial stations or balloon stations, but there is in the hands of the department the sum of \$10,821,000, which is left with the department, and with that they can proceed to construct a number of stations in continental United States.

The failure to carry any appropriations for field artillery purposes in this bill does not mean that the Ordnance Department will not have funds for these purposes until June 30, 1920. It does mean, however, that in order to finance the 1920 needs in connection with field artillery items, that the sum of at least \$31,000,000 must be saved from the balance on hand for the discharge of existing obligations. Neither does it mean that the committee entirely approves of the comprehensive plan of experimentation and development work outlined by the War Department under these items.

There are a number of experimental and development processes which are contemplated and which, in my judgment, are very necessary in order to perfect the present types of ordnance, because it was stated to the committee that this war has demonstrated that all of the types of ordnance used in the war, both by this country and by our allies, were in a measure obsolete on account of the information gained by our experience in the war.

It does, however, indicate that only such sums shall be expended from existing balances as may be needed to salvage and protect the vast quantities of material the Government has acquired and such additional sums as may be needed to carry out the military policy of the United States under whatever strength of army may be authorized for the coming year or may be warranted by the conclusions that may be reached by the conference of nations now being carried on.

The appropriations carried in the fortifications bill heretofore have been made without reference to a fiscal year and have continued available until they have been expended. The committee has recommended that the appropriations contained in the accompanying bill shall not be available after June 30, 1920, and that beginning with the fiscal year 1921, and annually thereafter, estimates for fortifications shall be made upon a fiscal-year basis. The greater number of the appropriations now provided in the bill are for maintenance purposes, and if appropriations for construction work which will require more than a fiscal year to complete are carried hereafter the question of their availability for more than a single fiscal year can be adjusted to fit the particular item. In connection with the placing of this bill upon a fiscal-year basis the committee also recommends that none of the unexpended balances of appropriations for fortifications remaining upon the books of the Treasury on June 30, 1920, shall be available for obligation after that date. Very



large sums have been appropriated during the war for purposes generally described as "fortifications," and especially with reference to field artillery. While portions of these have been repealed, the committee believe that a limit to the period of availability of any sums which may remain will result in a more careful checking up of expenditures from continuing appropriations than otherwise could be had. [Applause.]

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, during the past few years considerable criticism has been directed to our military and naval program. Our entrance into the war with Germany found us unprepared both from a military and naval standpoint. The fact that we were unprepared was seized upon as a ground for the charge that America did not have a military or naval policy. Any person who will make a study of military or naval affairs must be forced naturally to the conclusion that such criticism is entirely unfounded. The military and naval policy in the United States for a number of years prior to our entrance into the world war has been for a small Army and for a reasonably large Navy. Whatever of criticism, however, may be directed against our Military Establishment in this regard can not with any justice be urged against that branch of the service for which the fortifications bill makes financial provision.

Keeping in mind the real objects of fortifications, it is admitted by those who are familiar with our fortifications and works of defense that they are the best in the world. I do not believe it is contended by anyone that we should erect permanent fortifications at points along our coast, as well as along our northern and southern borders, sufficiently close together to prevent an enemy under all circumstances landing at some place on American soil. Such a plan has never for a moment been seriously considered by anyone. Such a plan never will be seriously considered.

Broadly speaking, the functions of coast fortifications are threefold: First, they are designed to defend a particular place such as a harbor or a large center of population, and by the defense of a harbor is included the prevention of an enemy fleet from entering the harbor and using it as a rendezvous; second, to release the Navy in order that it may attack an approaching enemy, when without the fortifications the Navy would be compelled to remain where it could defend such harbor or center of population; third, it would compel an enemy to go to some undesirable point in order to land.

How well we have succeeded in accomplishing these results can best be gathered from the opinions of men who are, from a technical standpoint as well as a personal knowledge of our coast fortifications, competent to judge.

Fortifications in the United States have grown with the art of gunmaking. When the navies of the world carried only cast-iron, smoothbore guns, up to the period of the Civil War, it was only necessary to place like armament upon our seacoast fortifications. But when the navies commenced to discard this class of armament and substituted in its place modern rifled ordnance it was necessary for us to displace the old cast-iron cannon with a piece of ordnance having a range equal to that of any gun that might be brought against it.

Various boards have been established from time to time by the War Department to establish standards for our coast fortifications. The Getty Board on Heavy Ordnance was appointed pursuant to an act of Congress of 1881. The Gun Foundry Board was appointed under an act of Congress of 1883. But the board which formulated the plans of our modern coast fortifications was known as the Endicott Board, which was appointed by the President on May 12, 1885, and made its report on January 23, 1886. The report of the Endicott Board was the rule that guided Congress in making appropriations for fortifications for more than 20 years. President Roosevelt constituted the National Defense Board, commonly known as the Taft Board, which made its report to Congress on March 5, 1906. This report, with slight modifications in its recommendations made from time to time by the War Department, continued to be the guide of Congress in making appropriations for fortifications after its adoption until 1916, when a new board appointed by the Secretary of War in February, 1915, made its report in 1916.

The estimated cost of constructing these works of defense under the several plans adopted from time to time by the acceptance of the reports of the various boards is as follows:

Endicott Board, scheme of fortifications, exclusive of ammunition, was	\$126,377,800
Taft Board, cost completing defenses, exclusive of ammunition	6,571,301
Taft Board, cost of ammunition	50,876,339
Board of Review projects	96,000,000

These reports of military boards composed of experts have been the charts guiding Congress in the making of appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense. Members of the committee can not form independent judgments that are worth anything on technical matters of this kind, but are forced to follow these charts that have been made for them by the men who are competent to pass upon these matters.

In 1914 Maj. Gen. Leonard A. Wood, then Chief of Staff, in a statement before the Subcommittee on Fortifications, gave it as his opinion that with the completion of the Taft board projects our fortifications were adequate. His statement was as follows:

Mr. SHERLEY. It has been testified heretofore that so far as the continental United States was concerned we were not only adequately fortified but in many instances overfortified.

Gen. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERLEY. And you concur in that general proposition?

Gen. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERLEY. In your judgment, would it ever be necessary, as to the large proportion of fortified places, to make any change in the armament that has been provided?

Gen. WOOD. No, sir; except possibly in the type of mortar carriages and some other minor changes which might involve the placing, possibly at an advanced point, a battery or two of a heavier type of gun, but essentially the present armaments will remain intact so far as we can see.

Gen. WOOD further stated that the Taft board project which Congress had approved remained to be completed; that some portions of it might not be needed, and he gave a list of the batteries, with their accessories, which it would be necessary to construct to fully complete the scheme.

In a statement before the Subcommittee on Fortifications in 1915 Maj. Gen. Erastus M. Weaver, who for many years was the efficient Chief of Coast Artillery and familiar with its every detail, speaking of our fortifications, said:

My opinion is that our system of fortifications is reasonably adequate for all defensive purposes which they are likely to be called upon to meet. \* \* \* I have been a close student of the whole subject, naturally, for a number of years, and I know of no fortifications in the world, as far as my reading, observation, and knowledge go, that compare favorably in efficiency with ours.

This year when this same subject was before the committee Gen. Black was questioned, and he answered as follows:

Mr. GOOD. What lessons have we learned during this war with regard to the power of guns or new implements of war that would change in any material degree the plans for the seacoast defenses as laid down by the board?

Gen. BLACK. I really can not say that there has been anything new brought out. The only new feature that has been brought out has been airplane fighting.

Mr. GOOD. How about the range of guns? Would that unsettle your plans?

Gen. BLACK. No, sir; not very much, or not more than we have outlined in the estimates, and that was foreseen.

I quote these experts on this subject only to show in a general way what our defenses are and as a further reason for our failure to adopt new and costly additions for our defenses which have never been adopted by the Board of Review.

Since these hearings were had we have done very much toward adding to our fortifications and strengthening those already constructed by the installation of guns of greater power and range. During the past 25 years the War Department has recognized the fact that as long as the art of war was in a stage of progress the plans of coast fortifications had to keep abreast with such progress; that the function of seacoast fortifications would not serve their full purpose unless such fortifications were able to cause a naval enemy to keep beyond the range of the armament of the fortifications. Unquestionably such a claim can truthfully be made for the fortifications of the United States.

Mr. DENISON. Does that include the Philippines?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; that includes the Philippines, Hawaii, Panama Canal Zone, and continental United States. The bill embraces the whole matter.

Mr. DENISON. I had reference to the statement which the gentleman has been reading. Had they a reference to these fortifications, too?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. I might say that our fortifications in the Philippines are finer even than those in the United States, as the construction there was commenced at a later date than our fortifications here, and I think without question they are the most modern fortifications in all the world.

Mr. DENISON. In that connection I want to repeat what I heard here in the House the other day in reference to the fortifications at the Panama Canal Zone—

Mr. GOOD. I can not yield for that purpose now. This splendid showing has, as I have already indicated, not come about by chance. The system adopted in the United States has been a consistent system and has been adopted by accepting the judgment of men qualified to pass on the subject.

I do not believe that any member of the committee professes to have that scientific knowledge requisite to say where a forti-



fiction should be placed, the character of the armament, or anything of that kind, and, so far as I know, it has never delegated to itself that authority; but what we have done is to take the report of these boards as they were brought down to date from time to time, analyze them carefully, consider very carefully the estimates for appropriations, and give such money as in the judgment of the committee was thought wise to appropriate under all the circumstances.

I do not mean to say that Congress has at all times followed explicitly the reports of the various boards or of the Secretary of War where he modifies the reports of any of these several boards. For instance, a few years ago an estimate was made by the War Department to build an artificial island down at Cape Henry. On investigation it was found that the total cost would be about \$30,000,000. That matter was before Congress for a number of years, was finally rejected by Congress and abandoned by the War Department, and yet able men from the War Department had advocated that work for a number of years. Take this year. Here we have estimates totaling \$71,740,180 for aero service.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The amount of \$125,000,000 under the Endicott Board plan has already been expended. What are the actual appropriations up to this time for our coast fortifications, approximately?

Mr. GOOD. I am sorry I can not give the gentleman that information; I do not know what the total is. My recollection is in the continental United States the armament alone is carried on inventory at something over \$50,000,000, and what the emplacements and armament cost, what additions in the way of alterations have been made, I do not know, as changes are constantly going on. This bill provides for one item of \$1,125,000 for alterations alone, a great deal of it to be expended to change certain carriages so they will give the guns an elevation of 20 degrees instead of 15 or less degrees, as now obtains for a great many of those guns.

Now, the committee had before it estimates for over \$71,000,000 for aerial stations. Already the War Department has \$10,800,000 that could be expended in continental United States for that purpose. The committee did not give anything for this project and for a very good reason.

In the first place, if the projects have the merit that the officers who came before the committee claimed for them, then it seemed to the committee that the War Department should ask this Board of Review, which is a permanent board, to modify their changes, and come before the committee with a complete report upon which the officers who have studied the problems agree that that is a solution. Suppose Congress would give \$71,000,000 on the request of the Secretary of War and the showing made by some subordinate officer without a report from the Board of Review, and then we should find we had made a mistake and that there had been great extravagance and waste and that these stations had been placed at points where they do not add to our defense? If that were done one can readily see the criticism for such useless expenditures might properly be directed toward the Congress.

Take the question of railway mounts. We were asked to give large sums of money—several millions of dollars—for railway mounts for these large guns. We went into that question quite fully. The Board of Review has not asked for a single railway mount to be provided for fortification purposes, and yet the Board of Review is a permanent board as now constituted. Hence this estimate comes without their approval so far as the record discloses. Gen. Black testified that there are two principal objections to railway mounts, so far as guns of large caliber is concerned; that is, over 10-inch guns. In the first place, you can not fire them as rapidly, and, in the second place, you can not fire them as accurately. When a gun at a fortification is fired at a moving target and that target is comparatively small, a battleship, for example, two things are absolutely essential; first, there must be absolute accuracy of fire if the fortifications are to be effective, and, secondly, there must be great rapidity of fire.

It is not like training a gun upon a big city like Metz, as Gen. Beach pointed out, with its fortifications and its manufacturing plants and its railroads. Used at such a place, if a projectile does not strike at the point where it was desired to strike it still does great damage if it destroys a railway or if it destroys a munition factory, or something of that kind. Not so with a moving target. If it fails to hit the battleship no damage is done. When the committee heard these conditions it did seem to us that before we provided for additional railway carriages in addition to those which we will obtain in bringing a great

many of them back from France, the Board of Review should take the matter up and study it in a scientific way, and then make a report to Congress upon which a layman could act in an intelligent way.

As stated by the chairman, there was estimated originally, before the armistice was signed, and in supplemental estimates, for the purposes of this bill, \$645,576,961. After the signing of the armistice additional estimates came in, estimates for objects that were not estimated for while war was in progress. And a revision brought the total amount down to \$92,893,657. The committee has reported this bill carrying \$11,199,000. While the reduction seems to be very large, I undertake to say that by that great reduction we have not postponed for a single day the completion of any project provided for, either in the Endicott Board, the Taft Board, or the Board of Review. But we did eliminate a great many things that were not provided for in the reports of any of these boards, and in some places we did not give as much money as was requested, because it was found that with the amounts appropriated and the money on hand the department would have more than it could probably expend.

A great deal of money was asked for making alterations in field artillery and field-artillery ammunition, and the committee was amazed and surprised to learn that after the millions and billions of dollars we had expended for field artillery the men best qualified to know stated to the committee that we did not have a piece of field artillery to-day but that was obsolete or comparatively so, and they wanted vast sums of money with which to commence the study of new types.

The same thing was true with regard to field artillery and other ammunition. The committee did not give any money for this purpose because the department, in the opinion of the committee, has sufficient funds with which to discharge its obligations and also to carry on reasonable investigations in this regard.

And I want now to call the attention of the House to a thing that I think the War Department intends to do that it should not be permitted to do.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield before he gets onto that question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. FESS. How long does it take to make a piece of artillery obsolete? What I am trying to get at is, is the change so frequent that it is impossible to keep up with the latest?

Mr. GOOD. Changes are constantly going on, and the only example that was brought before the committee's attention in that respect was of our 75-millimeter guns.

Mr. FESS. How old are they?

Mr. GOOD. They are new. We have turned out more since the signing of the armistice than we turned out before, so far as our own manufacture is concerned. It is said that that gun is practically obsolete, because that gun was designed to be drawn, as I now recall, by four horses—maybe it was eight horses—that the bringing into use of the self-propelled vehicle upon which these guns would be mounted makes the 75-millimeter gun interchangeable with the 88-millimeter gun of the Austrians, and that the two are interchangeable so far as mobility is concerned, but the range of the Austrian 88 is a great deal more than our 75.

Mr. FESS. I thank the gentleman. I did not want to interrupt his line of thought.

Mr. GOOD. I was speaking about a matter which I think the War Department has no authority to do with money in its hands. A considerable amount of money was asked for the purpose of making experiments in ammunition. We have already appropriated vast sums of money for ammunition, and a great deal of it was used for the purpose of constructing nitrate plants. We built four nitrate plants—one at Sheffield, one at Muscle Shoals, one at Toledo, and one at Cincinnati, or rather we commenced one at Cincinnati. Now it has been discovered that the ammonium nitrate we are manufacturing at Muscle Shoals, for instance, where one plant has been completed, has turned out commercially so that it can not be used for fertilizer. It cakes rapidly. It must be produced in a more powdered form in order to be available for commercial fertilizer; and the War Department asked the committee for \$300,000 to build a laboratory in the city of Washington to make this investigation, not for war purposes but for commercial purposes. That might be desirable, but so far as the money that was appropriated for war purposes is concerned, not a single penny of it ought to be expended for any commercial purposes, no matter how desirable it might be to do work along that line. The committee on fortification has no jurisdiction of that subject.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would like to say at that point in the gentleman's argument that I have been informed within the



past two weeks that the Muscle Shoals plant has been entirely shut down and is not now in operation.

Mr. GOOD. That is correct. The committee went into that question. We have fine buildings at Muscle Shoals and fine buildings at Sheffield, where this experimental work could be done, and the committee was amazed to find that the only substantial reason urged why it could not be done there, if done at all, and why it should be done at Washington, was that the officers in the Army would not live at Muscle Shoals or at Sheffield; that neither was a desirable place in which to live. I do not know whether that would be true of Cincinnati or not.

Mr. LONGWORTH. They would have all flocked there.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman said "expended," but he did not say how much, on the Sheffield and Muscle Shoals plants.

Mr. GOOD. I do not have the figures at hand but my recollection of the figures is that these four plants have cost us considerably over \$100,000,000.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I can state that so far there has been over \$65,000,000 expended at plant No. 2 at Muscle Shoals alone, and the estimates are that it will amount to about \$80,000,000, and the plant is now closed.

Mr. GOOD. Then the entire expenditures for nitrate plants will run very much over \$100,000,000.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman says that the location of the plant at Cincinnati would not be a desirable place to live. I will say it is located close to Amelia, Ohio, and it is a very desirable place to live in.

Mr. SLOAN. May I ask the gentleman what is the objection to living in Cincinnati?

Mr. GOOD. I take it none. Cincinnati is a very desirable place to live in, no doubt.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that we are particular as to whom we will allow to come there. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOOD. That may account for the fact that the War Department was unable to locate this \$300,000 plant down there. [Laughter.]

I submit that a very substantial reason is given in this connection for a little discipline to some of these Army officers, whether they want to live there or not. If it is necessary to do this work, they ought to be compelled to live there. Other people live in these communities, the plants were located by the War Department, and in constructing them the officers of the War Department ought to have taken into consideration then the desirability or undesirability of the location within which people might comfortably live, and if workmen can live there it is a fit place for officers to live.

But, as I have said, there is another objection which to my mind is even greater, and that is that this bill does not and should not carry a provision for studying commercial standards for anything. This is the fortification bill, and the money appropriated under this bill is purely for military purposes, and not a penny of it is authorized to be expended for purposes such as are proposed. And I for one propose to see to it that the policy that has always prevailed in behalf of the War Department and Congress, so far as the items carried in this bill are concerned, shall be followed out, and that not a single penny shall be expended for matters that are not specifically authorized.

The bill this year, as I stated, carries something over \$11,000,000. The average appropriation for 10 years prior to 1917 by the fortification appropriation bill is a trifle over \$6,000,000 per annum. It is fair, however, to say that this bill carries some objects not formerly carried during those years in the fortification bill. It takes care of the fortifications at Panama, and contains an item of \$4,000,000 for the erection of barracks and quarters at Panama for two regiments of Infantry.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. I see we continue to spend money in defending Panama, and in fortifying Panama against any invasion that might be attempted there.

Mr. GOOD. Yes. We carry a considerable sum.

Mr. SLOAN. What is the object of defending it since the United States has no special privileges reserved to its citizens there?

Mr. GOOD. A few Members of Congress think we have some special interests at Panama worth protecting, and they are not only willing to protect them, but intend to see to it that ample protection is afforded.

Mr. SLOAN. But the House some years ago yielded them up at the request of the Executive, but without my vote.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does it take \$4,000,000 to shelter two regiments of Infantry?

Mr. GOOD. Those buildings are to be fireproof buildings. They are barracks and quarters. There is a great deal of work to be done in the way of bringing water to the barracks, and quite a considerable expenditure for sewers and the like. At the present time the only provision for the troops at Panama is on one side of the canal, while the railway and the places where it was desired to keep the troops are on the other side.

There are no barracks there at all where the men can find shelter, except the barracks formerly occupied by the Porto Rican regiment. That regiment has gone back to Porto Rico, and it is impossible to use those barracks for the shelter of those that we are sending there at present. The bill also provides for storage for hay and grain and a few things of that kind.

I will say to my colleague that the amount estimated was considerably in excess of that, but the estimates were made at a time when everything—labor and materials—was at the peak, and the committee seemed to think that we could reasonably cut the estimates by about 15 or 20 per cent, which we did.

There is also an item in the bill which is unusual, and helps to swell the total by something over \$500,000—for the protection of Sandy Hook. That matter has been before our committee for a couple of years. The action of the waves at that point upon a narrow strip has been to encroach upon the land, washing away the trestles that carry the Government railroad and endangering our fortifications there as well. The committee, after considerable hesitancy, decided that that piece of land—that reservation there containing many thousands of acres of land—was worth protecting, and especially in view of the fact that we maintain a large garrison there and have very extensive fortifications at that point. Therefore we thought that we should yield to the demands that have been made for several years, inasmuch as the work of encroachment upon the land seemed to be going on.

But the one thing about the bill that, it seems to me, ought to commend it to the House is the fact that, while it represents a cut of over \$80,000,000 from the amount recommended by the War Department, it will not in the slightest degree prevent the carrying on of the work as outlined by the Board of Review for Seacoast Fortifications.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman's time expired, so that he has not time to answer any questions in regard to the bill?

Mr. GOOD. I shall be glad to answer.

Mr. DENISON. The act of 1916 in regard to this John Hays Hammond apparatus appropriated \$417,000, and provided that no part of that amount should be expended until the Government had first secured from Mr. Hammond his rights. That is repealed in this act, and this act appropriates \$417,000 for the purpose of going ahead and making the demonstrations, with no assurance whatever that the Government will get the rights after it has made the expenditure. Is that the intention of the committee?

Mr. GOOD. No; it is not the intention of the committee, and I do not think the language of the bill warrants that interpretation. All we have done by this provision is to permit the expenditure of \$417,000 prior to the acceptance of the patent to be acquired from Mr. Hammond.

Mr. DENISON. Can the gentleman point out any language which secures to the Government the patent rights in case they go ahead and make the demonstration?

Mr. GOOD. The Government's rights are secured, not by the act of 1916 alone, but rather by the contracts with Mr. Hammond mentioned in that act. The fact that the Government has entered into a contract with John Hays Hammond, jr., for the purchase of this, and that that contract is referred to in the legislation which authorized the purchase of these patents, the act of July 6, 1916, known as proposal Z, which was made by John Hays Hammond, jr., and that the patents themselves will repose in the Patent Office under a special provision whereby no one can get them and no one can see them, ought to be sufficient warrant to the Government that it will get the patents if the board finally conclude that they are a desirable thing to acquire.

Mr. DENISON. I think that is true, if they have such a contract.

Mr. GOOD. They have. [Applause.]

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] four minutes.



Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I have here in my hand an account of the work done by the rifle makers at Eddystone. Samuel M. Vauchain, who is the first vice president and general manager of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, was the farseeing man under whose direction this plant was built. I recall that the Baldwin Locomotive Works at one time made two locomotives a day. Now they make 10 each day of the heaviest sort of locomotives. Mr. Vauchain put through the plant at Eddystone in eight months. At the beginning there was a swampy piece of ground. At the end of that time there was a plant with 33 acres of floor space, 15,000 men employed, and 10,000 machines at work. They made 1,000,000 rifles for the allies abroad and 60 per cent of the rifles for the Americans. These men stayed at home to help in the work of preparation. Mr. Vauchain chose for his assistants Mr. Charles H. Schlacks and Maj. Garrett. He planned this great plant, organized it, made it do its work, and now its work is done.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a newspaper account of the work done by the rifle makers at Eddystone.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MARTIN). Is there objection to the gentleman inserting in the RECORD the article which he refers to?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

**EDDYSTONE SOON TO CEASE LABOR—BIGGEST RIFLE WORKS IN WORLD WILL CLOSE JANUARY 11—JOB DONE, AND WELL.**

The rifle makers at Eddystone stop work January 11, but their spirit and their achievement will go marching down through history.

These workers, men and women, own a full share in the glory of the war with the boys who gave their lives at Chateau Thierry and Belleau Wood.

For Eddystone made the rifles that drove the Kaiser out of France. Washington has ordered a discontinuance of the manufacture of arms. The need has passed for rifle making by the million. Eddystone has done its job, just as our fighting forces in France have done theirs.

The workers at Eddystone wear on their breasts, whether they be mechanics or executives, a bronze medal of honor. It was given them by the Government when they had completed the millionth rifle for the American Army.

That medal tells the story of the Midvale Steel & Ordnance Co.

The great rifle plant met the stirring emergency of war as gallantly and as victoriously as the Army which it equipped with weapons.

**BIGGEST IN THE WORLD.**

The Midvale Steel & Ordnance Co. is the biggest rifle works in the world. It made 60 per cent of all the rifles manufactured for the United States Army.

A large majority of the rifles that spat lead and death at the boche in the last decisive battles of the war were made at Eddystone. Many a straight-shooting American rifleman, coolly pausing as he advanced through gusts of shrapnel and machine-gun bullets to take aimed shots at the enemy, defended his life with an Eddystone rifle.

It would be almost literally true to say that every rifle used in battle was an Eddystone product. If we except a few hundred thousand Springfields, the only rifles which got abroad to the boys in the fight were made at Eddystone.

So, perhaps, it isn't too much to say that the 15,000 men and women who toiled in the great Eddystone factory, with its 10,000 machines and its 33 acres of floor space, possess a proud share in the honors of victory.

They are still making rifles at Eddystone. But within a year there will be no sign of the present rifle plant. The vast building will be there, but the floors will have been gutted out and huge overhead cranes will swing their chain cables from under the roof. The great rifle works will become a great boiler shop, part of the Baldwin plant.

To date the Midvale Steel & Ordnance Co. has made, in round numbers, 2,000,000 rifles for both the British and American Governments. It armed Britain before it armed America.

When working at top speed it has employed as many as 10,000 hands, 20 per cent of them being women.

Its pay roll has run about \$375,000 a week.

Its 10,000 machines are worth \$5,000,000 alone.

It has had on hand constantly reserve stocks of cutting tools made of the costliest steel, worth from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000.

Day after day it has turned out complete 5,500 rifles—some days 6,500.

Every part for every rifle, down to the smallest screws, has been made in the plant.

To make 5,000 rifles in a day entails a total of 15,000,000 single operations.

By September of 1917 its first American rifle was delivered to the Government.

Twelve months later it had completed 1,000,000 rifles.

These facts and figures give some notion of the vastness of the plant. Only a visit to the place itself and hours spent walking through its acres of swiftly whirling belts and speeding machines could convey an adequate idea of the plant's great size and ceaseless industry.

The beginnings of the great arms factory at Eddystone go back to the early days of the European war, when England's need created it and when few Americans were sufficiently farseeing to realize that ultimately this country would become involved.

**VAUCHAIN'S PROPHECY.**

One man at least who had to do with the erection of the Eddystone rifle plant read the handwriting on the wall. He was Samuel M. Vauchain, vice president of the Baldwin Locomotive Works. The Baldwin Co. built the plant. When the broad lines of its construction were being laid out Mr. Vauchain said, in effect, to his associates:

"Let us build it big. Let us make it the greatest of rifle plants, for sooner or later this country must be drawn into the war, and if we build adequately now we will be able to do our best for the Nation then."

So they built it as it stands. When America sprang to arms to help the world win back its freedom the Midvale Steel & Ordnance Co.

was ready. The machines were there, needing but few changes to manufacture the American type of rifle. The executive personnel was there. A large nucleus of trained and expert men and women were ready to build the rifles that armed Americans in the great cause. The rifle plant was a great, swift-running, perfectly functioning organization.

Back in 1914, when the war caught all the world but Germany unprepared, Britain needed rifles. Her own plants could not turn them out nearly fast enough. She came for help to industrial America.

In May of 1915 the spot where the rifle plant now stands was a great tract of swampy land adjacent to the Baldwin works at Eddystone. On May 11 ground was broken for the rifle works.

Mid-August saw the first pieces of machinery stored in the building, then well on toward completion. By the end of the month the furnaces were going in.

The last day of 1915 at the Eddystone plant was historic. On that day they completed their first rifle for the British Government.

From the breaking of ground in a swamp it had taken less than eight months to build a modern factory with 33 acres of floor space; to purchase and set up rifle-making machinery, all of which had to be especially manufactured for the purpose; to get together a huge stock of the finest and scarcest steels; to fabricate millions of small parts, made with accuracy carried to the thousandth part of an inch and less; to assemble these in the completed product.

**RIFLES FOR THE BRITISH.**

It was an achievement even in this day and land of mechanical miracles.

In all, the Midvale Steel & Ordnance Co. made 600,000 rifles for the British Government. Most of them went to France. One hundred thousand, however, were shipped to far Mesopotamia, where sun-bitten English Tommies carried them in that terrible march to Bagdad.

The rifle made for England was the Enfield of 1914, chambered for the British type of rim cartridge of .303 caliber. A fine, hard-shooting, accurate weapon, the best rifle that had been devised prior to the war. And these rifles were turned out in such huge quantities at Eddystone that at the peak of production the Midvale Steel & Ordnance Co. was making more English rifles than all the arsenals and private plants of England combined.

Then came our entrance into the war. From the first month it was evident that we would need huge armies. They had to be raised, trained, equipped, transported abroad in record time. Making rifles for them was one of our biggest problems.

Shortly after war was declared the officials of the country's various rifle plants were called to Washington for a conference with Secretary Baker. He laid the Nation's needs before them. He asked them to estimate how long it would take to deliver rifles of the American type in the quantities needed. They said six months.

The Midvale Steel & Ordnance Co. agreed to furnish its first quota of American rifles by November 12, 1917.

It did so on September 17.

By September of 1918, a year after these first rifles were turned over to the United States, a total of 1,000,000 had been manufactured and delivered.

This was record production—faster than even the British rifles were made.

**THE MILLIONTH RIFLE.**

On the 23d of September the employees of the plant celebrated the making of the millionth rifle. It was a great occasion. The broad courtyard in front of the rifle factory held 14,000 people—workers and guests. Secretary Daniels was there, with representatives of the Secretary of War, of the Army, of the various departments of the Government. Brig. Gen. John T. Thompson, present director of arsenals at Washington, and one of the men who assisted in the organization and development of the Eddystone plant, cabled news of the millionth rifle to Gen. Pershing.

Mr. Vauchain, on behalf of the plant's employees, presented the millionth rifle to Charles H. Schlacks, general manager of the works and the man who is credited by officers and employees alike with having had the biggest share in perfecting and maintaining the great organization.

This millionth rifle was bought for him by the employees themselves. They subscribed a penny each to make the purchase—and had more than a hundred dollars over for the Red Cross.

To show the spirit of industry of the great plant, it might be mentioned here that the employees on that gala day, when they celebrated the making of the millionth rifle, kept right on the job until 3.30 o'clock in the afternoon. Until the moment the whistle sounded to cease work the machines and the men and women who ran them sped faster, if anything, than usual, so that there might be no production loss.

The spirit of the employees is one of the most interesting things about the big rifle works. They have earned good wages, but they have given full value. Never was there a day's shutdown; never was there an hour's labor disturbance. The workers were too busy, too patriotic, too certain of the fair intentions of their employers, to listen to agitators.

**MILLIONS FOR LIBERTY BONDS.**

It is significant, too, that the workers, men and women, bought more than \$3,000,000 worth of the various liberty loan issues, besides investing large sums in war-savings stamps and contributing generously to the War Chest and Red Cross.

So much for the workers—now for their product.

The rifles made at Eddystone for the American Army are the last word in small arms. They combine the best qualities of both the British Enfield and the old American Springfield.

The British Army uses a cartridge of .303 caliber. The American Army for years has been using a .30-caliber cartridge. When our country went into the war American rifle plants, which had been making small arms for England, could have continued making the same type and caliber arm for the United States without the loss of a day.

That, however, would have made necessary two kinds of ammunition. Rather than risk the danger and inconvenience of this course, the War Department accepted the delay incidental to changing machines and manufacturing a new stock of parts.

The lessons American rifle makers had learned in manufacturing the British Enfield helped make the new American rifle the truest-shooting, hardest-hitting military rifle ever devised.

The rifles with which our new armies are equipped is known as the United States rifle, caliber .30, model 1917. It has a muzzle velocity of 2,750 feet, compared to the 2,200 feet muzzle velocity of the Enfield. The explosive pressure developed in the American rifle is 51,000 pounds, compared to the 40,000 pounds of the British arm. Our rifles are



tested with a bursting charge equivalent to 70,000 pounds to the inch, as against the 52,000-pound-per-inch test charge of the Enfield.

The gun made at Eddystone and used by our troops in France will kill a man at 3 miles.

It shoots so accurately that a trained marksman can hit an individual with it at a full mile.

It is worth while quoting a letter written by an Army captain in France about the Eddystone rifle to one of the assistant general managers of the plant:

"We went through the St. Mihiel drive, and as I write the drive of November 1 is going merrily on—started 3.15 a. m. Some 3,600 pieces of artillery let go at that time. You can easily imagine the way the earth rocked as 'Wilson's answer' went home. Our big guns usually carry a placard, 'Wilson's answer,' and after the barrage has been placed and our boys go over, then the Springfield-Enfield, or model 1917, rifles come into their own.

#### THE RIFLE FOR BAYONET WORK.

"I have handled many rifles, old and new—Springfields, Kraggs, Mausers, and a few others—but when it comes to service the sturdy-built Eddystone rifle certainly delivers the goods. The stock is so strong that it makes an ideal rifle for bayonet work. I have in St. Mihiel seen many evidences of the bayonet on the business end of an Enfield make perfectly good Huns out of bad ones—they were, of course, dead ones. The German rifle is but a toy compared to ours."

The man who wrote that letter knows the Eddystone rifle. He has staked his life on it.

The letter links the shops with the battle field. The same spirit of service that made our soldiers indomitable in the field has animated the men and women at lathe and drill. They, too, are heroes.

Go into the shops and you will see this spirit.

It is impossible to describe the actual making of rifles at Eddystone. It is an extremely complex undertaking—as you may realize if you reflect a moment upon the statement made early in this article that there are 15,000,000 single operations entailed in a day's output of 5,000 rifles.

To do so vast a job in a day with even the 15,000 employees who were at work with production at its height naturally means perfect system. Every man does just his own job. He has studied every movement of hands and body so as to get the most work out of the fewest motions. He may operate one or several machines. If several, he times their operations so that he can adjust one idle tool while the others are working.

Every floor of the great plant is close packed with machinery, ranged in broad trucks that clang about all day, with aisles so that electric "jitneys," the loads of raw material, or parts in various stages of completion can run freely back and forth.

As far as eye can reach down the long vistas of machinery stretch forests of belting—there are 75 miles of whirling belts in the "receiver department" alone.

The making of this receiver—in layman's language the part of the rifle that holds the loading and firing mechanism—is one of the most painstaking and important tasks in rifle manufacture. It goes through 144 operations. At the start it is a forging of the finest steel weighing 8 pounds. Complete, it weighs about 8 ounces.

#### LEARNED AS THEY WORKED

When the Eddystone plant was built, few men understood rifle making. Few plants made the machine tools for it. Eddystone studied the problem as it unfolded, first adopting and then perfecting processes already in use.

Automatic tools are used in most operations. They are marvelously accurate. In this connection it might be mentioned that the Midvale Steel & Ordnance Co. has the finest machine-tool shop in America, devoted entirely to the manufacture of its own cutting tools.

One of the most engrossing operations to watch is the boring of rifle barrels. The barrel is whirled against a hollow, stationary drill at the speed of 1,800 revolutions a minute. Oil forced through the drill under pressure brings back the minute steel chips. A barrel is drilled at the rate of about an inch a minute. A somewhat similar machine reams out the first fine hole cut by the drill. Still another puts in the delicate grooves which we know as "rifling."

Before the rifle is assembled the barrel and action are tested by firing through them a special bursting charge developing a pressure of 70,000 pounds to the square inch. The test shot is fired into sand. A number of rifles are fired at once, racked in a frame, and discharged automatically. The testing is done in a series of little armored rooms, bullet and splint proof, and the operator fires only after he has taken position behind a thick steel shield, to guard against the danger of a defective barrel.

The assembled rifle is fired again for accuracy by Government experts. Every process of its manufacture, of course, is under Government supervision. There are more than a thousand Government employees at Eddystone who do nothing but inspect. The plant's own inspectors likewise follow the rifle through all its processes, from raw material to finished product.

This firing for accuracy is one of the things that catches the interest of the outsider visiting the plant, if he be lucky enough to win through the door that is guarded against even plant employees, into the long, narrow "shooting gallery." Here experts "lay" the rifle with the aid of a telescopic sight. Fifty-six rifle tests are going at once. They are fired at small paper targets set up 100 feet from the muzzle. Four out of five shots must hit inside a rectangle measuring one by one and a half inches.

#### EYE-STRAIGHTENING BARRELS.

Another fascinating operation is the final straightening of rifle barrels. This is done by eye, which proves more accurate than any machine yet devised.

The experts who do this work use a big and curious vise, with a jaw actuated by a heavy wheel. The contrivance looks like an old-fashioned letter press set on a pedestal about as high as a man's head. The straightener puts the barrel in his vise and sights through the bore at a straight black line on the background of a glazed glass window. He doesn't see the line through the barrel, but he does see two parallel shadows cast down the barrel half its length. If the shadows are exactly parallel, the barrel is straight. If they waver, the barrel is crooked, and pressure of the vise is applied at the right place to straighten it.

It takes a highly educated eye to see the slight wavering of these lines. Not every eye is capable of this kind of education. Barrel straighteners are "born," the experts say, more truly even than are poets. When Eddystone got into the business of rifle making there were only three or four real barrel straighteners obtainable in the country. Eddystone hired as much of the available supply as was possible, then began to train a big corps of experts of its own.

It is related that about the best man developed at Eddystone had never looked through a rifle barrel in his life before some one accidentally discovered the power he did not know he owned. He had been employed for months in the plant as an iceman, delivering ice in a zinc-lined truck.

While you watch, a gunstock is made. Saws, drills, turning lathes work with human accuracy. Each process takes but a few moments. When cut and turned the stocks are put in racks and dipped in linseed oil, which soaks into every pore.

Stock assembly is comparatively simple—if you are an expert—because of the absolute interchangeability of parts. Before Eddystone studied and perfected this assembly job a good workman would put together 50 rifles in a day and feel proud of his work. Now many of the men assemble 200 rifles a day. One man, who holds the plant record, has assembled 285 rifles in 10 hours.

#### READY FOR THE FRONT.

When the last job is done and the rifle stands complete it is given a protecting bath of vaseline before being packed for shipment. In a rack with many others it is swung over a vat of hot vaseline and dipped in. The liquid vaseline clings to barrel, stock, and working parts. When it hardens it makes a thick incrustation, impervious to water or dampness.

Then the rifles are ready for packing, 10 to the crate. They go out in freight cars or motor trucks, which are run right into the delivery room for loading. And then overseas.

This is but a glimpse of the work at Eddystone, a few of the things that stand out so vividly that the least technical visitor can not help seeing them. It would be a hopeless task to attempt to picture the real sights and sounds of the place.

Eddystone is still hard at work, despite the Government order that will put out the forge fires and still the roar of the hammer shop next month. Between 3,000 and 5,000 employees are at work there now.

Eddystone has completed its task. It has faced and won its big fight. It will simply be "demobilized," like the gallant Army it equipped.

The thousands who work there will carry with them, when they leave the plant next January, the same deep, quiet pride that is the soldier's best memento of the war. They have done their work.

Mr. GOOD. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I wish the attention of the House for a few minutes while I refer to some matters that I think are of extraordinary importance to every citizen of the United States, and of especial importance to every industry in the United States and to every one dependent upon those industries.

It may not be generally known, but it is true, that it is almost impossible for any person, firm, or corporation to export any article from the United States to Holland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, or any of the neutral countries. It occurs to me that it is time the people of the United States are apprised of the reasons why this extraordinary condition exists. Before a person can export any article out of this country to any neutral country he must first get a permit from the country to which it is expected to export the goods in order to obtain a license from this country to export them. Whenever an attempt is made by any exporter in the United States to send any of his manufactured goods abroad, before he can get a permit from the War Trade Board in the city of Washington he must show to the War Trade Board that the consignee has a permit to receive those goods over on the other side. For this reason the United States is not exporting goods of any consequence to-day. The result is that idleness in this country is constantly increasing while the volume of business is diminishing, until to-day many of the railroads of this country are doing 40 per cent less business than they were doing at the time the armistice was signed.

Now, what brought about all this? When the war was on there was organized what is known as the Netherlands Overseas Trust. Its purpose was to prevent goods shipped from the United States into any of these countries that I have named from sifting into the enemy countries. When this trust was organized it was dominated and controlled by British influences and British officers.

It is likewise controlling to-day, and they are exercising the same domination and enforcing the same boycott with reference to goods manufactured in the United States that they were exercising at the time the war was on. So that before the person now can get any goods into Holland or any of these countries, the person who is to receive the goods in that country must get a license to receive them before the War Trade Board will give a license to ship them.

What is the result? A cable is sent over for the purpose of getting the license required over there. No return is had inside of 25 or 30 days. In the meantime the man who wants the goods is compelled to go to some place else to purchase. The gentlemen who are censors on the other side find out whether it is possible for these wants to be supplied with manufactured goods furnished by somebody in the English Empire, and they are bold to say, and I have the concrete evidence here and will furnish it to anyone who wishes to know the fact, or to any investigating committee, that they have in the United States customhouses and in the United States men, British officers, who will say to the American shipper or the



man who wants to ship, "We do not propose that you shall ship anything out of the United States that we can manufacture and ship from Great Britain."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is it part of the same scheme that the censorship has been retained on the mails of the country?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; and I want to give you an illustration of these facts. There are British export houses in the United States that can send a cablegram from here to Singapore with reference to the shipment of their goods and get a return in two or three days. On the other hand, an American exporter, exporting the same character of goods, can send a cablegram to Singapore and he can not be answered in 30 days. These are facts capable of proof, and it is time that the American Congress should be advised as to why this is so.

Now, I want to call attention to a few concrete examples. There was an American concern organized and established to export from the United States to Samarang, in the Dutch East Indies, organized by American capital, seeking to take advantage of the situation for the purpose of extending American trade. They opened up their house in Samarang, and the very first attempt they made to export any goods from this country to that distributing house they were notified by the War Trade Board that the shipments could not be made. When asked why, they said because objection had come from the Netherlands Overseas Trust. When asked why, there was an intimation that the parties conducting this concern were disloyal. But they were Americans with American capital, and when asked to be furnished with the proof of their disloyalty, protesting that they were as loyal as anybody in the United States, they were advised that they could not have the information upon which the action of our department was based. The result was that hundreds of thousands of dollars put into this investment in that legitimate business was absolutely wasted.

Here is another concrete example to which I wish to call the attention of the committee: There was a concern in this country seeking to ship 3,000 cases of tea. They sought to get a permission for the house on the other side that wanted to get tea but they could not get it, and in consequence could not get the license on this side. When the reason was asked why this permit would not be granted on the other side they were informed by this Netherlands Overseas Trust that they proposed that it should be supplied immediately from Java and not shipped from any other country. Tea was selling here for 53 cents a pound. It was selling in Holland for \$3 or \$3.50, depending on the quality. After refusing to grant a permit to the American exporter, within two days after the refusal an agent of Sir Thomas Lipton came into this house and made a proposition to purchase this tea. When informed of the attempt to ship it across to the other side and the reason given why they could not ship it, the agent said, "We will take care of that." The result was that this house sold the tea to Lipton's agent and it was shipped from here to England and from there into Holland, at the price of \$3 to \$3.50.

That is going on constantly in this country, and I dare say that every Member of this House that has manufacturing industries in his district is receiving almost daily complaints from men who are seeking to ship out their goods in order that they may keep their factories going and in order that they may give employment to their men, and are met with these same results.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. I understood the gentleman to say a while ago that the British are maintaining officers at our ports to see that no goods were shipped out or only such goods as they would permit to be shipped out. Does the gentleman mean to be shipped to Great Britain or does he mean to any point in the world?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. To any point in the world where the British can supply the goods.

Mr. KEARNS. What rights have British officers at our ports to tell any American shipper where he can ship his goods, provided he does not want to ship them to England?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. British officers are telling the American manufacturers that they can not ship their goods or they will see to it that they will not be permitted to ship them as long as manufacturing concerns in Great Britain can supply the demand. There is a man now located, or there was in the month of January, and I dare say he is there now, in the customhouse in the city of New York, who has the unadulterated gall to send out and bring in exporters whom he knows are seeking to export goods out of this country into Sweden, into Switzerland, and into the Netherlands, and to tell them "You must cease your efforts, for we will not permit you

to ship anything," and when asked why they are not permitted to do this thing, he simply smiles and says, "Because we are controlling the shipping of this country to-day and expect to continue to do it as long as the present embargo exists."

I think it would be very interesting to call your attention to what this gentleman has said. This is what the exporter says, addressing the British agent:

I can tell you this, that since a couple of weeks ago I have been making complaints to the proper authorities in Washington about this obstructing of American business by the censor of cables in London, and from now on I certainly will make more complaints on every specific case that might come to my attention where we can prove that cables or letters are held up for a certain length of time; and then really the climax of our conversation came. Both the captain and his assistant smiled, and they asked me, "Mr. Stork, so you really think they act on these complaints in Washington?" I think this is about the limit, unless they could have gone a little further and said, "Do you really think they dare to act upon these complaints?" The whole interview really came down to this: They told me to my face that I would not have a ghost of a chance to promote American business so long as the Britishers could prevent it. At the end of this conversation I asked Capt. Makins, who is this British officer, "Captain, now that we have been talking so frankly to each other, how long do you figure you Britishers can play this game?" He said, "Oh, anyhow for several months, because we are running the actual blockade and we won't take it off."

That is the situation, if you please.

Mr. SLAYDEN. What did he mean by "running the actual blockade"?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They meant that they were in control. They have established this blockade by reason of these two facts. In the first place, the exporter from this side must get a permit before he can ship any goods out of this country, abroad, and before he can get a permit from his own country to ship it this Netherlands Overseas Trust sees to it that the gentleman on the other side does not get his permit, and, in consequence, the exporter on this side can not get his license here, and it is just as complete a blockade as could possibly be made. That thing is going on, and has been going on, continuously, and just think of the idea of this country, which has done so much for the allies, being absolutely prohibited from any commercial intercourse with the allies, absolutely prohibited, if you please, from any intercourse with the neutral countries, and the whole business being done by a gentleman not of our country, yet, if you please, with the very sanction, if not with the encouragement, of our country, when they are permitting such men as Makins in the customhouse in the city of New York to take the high-handed action he has taken in the cases named.

Mr. SLAYDEN. What do our people here say in explanation of such an extraordinary state of affairs?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They say this, that under the arrangement they have with the allies, and under the arrangement they have with Great Britain, with reference to passing censorship upon all goods shipped into Denmark, Holland, Switzerland, and these other countries, as long as that arrangement stands they are bound upon this side. It was once said that Nero sat on a hill and fiddled with delight while he was watching a city, of more or less respectability burn. While the business industries of this country are going to pot as rapidly as they can, those who are in absolute control, at the heads of these departments, are attending to everybody's business but our own.

That is the reason why this thing has been continued thus far unchecked and uncriticized. If you go to one of these departments to-day—go to the War Trade Board, if you please—and ask them why this is thus and so, and they will admit that all the criticism you make is absolutely true and obtains, but that they are powerless to change any order until their chief comes back. He is away on the other side. You go to the Shipping Board and you meet with the same response there. The heads of all of these departments are away from their place of business, and where they ought to be attending to the interests of the people of the United States and are gallivanting around on the other side. That is one reason.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. DENISON. This arrangement was evidently entered into during the war, and when there might have been some possible excuse for it, but it was never intended to continue it with the consent of our Government during peace times when we ought to be restoring our industries?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Absolutely; and here is the proposition: The other countries, our allies, are taking advantage of this situation—taking and tying up the threads of commercial intercourse broken by reason of the war and reestablishing their trade while we are absolutely prohibited from entering into that competition at all. If it continues for many months, and Mr. Makin says it will continue for many months, these new trade relations will have been established and it will be hard, indeed, for a manufacturer and exporter of the United States



to break in. I am not blaming England for taking the advantage that she naturally would take as a competitor in business, but I am blaming the administration of the United States that is not only permitting but encouraging, by inaction at least, this very kind of treatment of our exporters. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to submit a few remarks about cotton. I am in favor of lifting the embargo against the raw materials of America on everything, including cotton. I think the time has come when we must look out for the products of our farms, our factories, and of our mines. I am not in favor of permitting any foreign countries now to buy up the raw material of America in congested markets with the price beat down, because of any embargo condition that now exists, and then move that produce to the foreign country and sell it at a greatly increased price to the consumers of that country. To-day the cotton producers of America are being wonderfully handicapped by conditions that exist in the embargo, and the time has come when that embargo should be lifted. I stand ready to support a measure that will lift it. I will support a measure that will lift the embargo against the other products of America. Now, gentlemen, the wheat crop of America, estimated to be worth about \$1,600,000,000—when the war ended the price of wheat fell, because a big crop was coming in, it was said. Now, the Government comes in and it takes up the loss that the wheat grower would sustain, and it is going to protect him. The cotton producers of the United States, with a crop estimated to be worth a billion and a half dollars, are suffering a loss now, and what are we doing to protect the cotton producer and prevent his loss? He does not ask the Government at this stage to come to his rescue with money. All that the producer asks is that this Government will give him a fair chance with his product. He asks that the embargo in every form be lifted on the cotton going to the consuming world. If you will permit that the foreign spinners will pay the producers of the United States inside of 30 days from 30 to 35 cents a pound for this cotton. If you do not permit that then the foreign spinners will be aided in their scheme to rob the American cotton producers.

The purpose is to beat down the price of cotton so that the cotton merchants of Europe can buy it cheaply, and then they will sell it to some of the spinners of the Old World at from 40 to 50 cents a pound. I am not in favor of sitting here and permitting the American producer to be robbed in this fashion. We asked the Rules Committee of this House, and I appeal to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] a member of that committee as well as to the Members on this side to report out the Caraway resolution that will permit an investigation of the New York and New Orleans Cotton Exchanges to see how much cotton they have on hand, the character of that cotton, and see how many contracts with legitimate speculators are actually filled and how much of that is a gambling transaction.

Gentlemen, great reforms come about in times of stress and strain, and it may be the time has come to prevent gambling in cotton and grain. Let us investigate these exchanges. I hold that the New York Cotton Exchange is buying cheap cotton—low-grade cotton—and tendering it on these contracts of the middling grade. For instance, if you buy a contract on the middling basis, and they tender you a cotton they call middling and it is not, and the middling price is 30 cents a pound, they will tender you stuff that they buy for 19 cents a pound; and when you ask for a difference in the grades and settlements they will tell you it is a dollar and a quarter, and you will insist that it is \$8.50; but you have no remedy.

I charge that these exchanges as now conducted are no longer places for safe and honest hedging. Ask the spinners of New England; ask the spinners of the South if they are. Ask the producer if they aid him. If they do not, why should the Congress of the United States permit them to longer exist? To-day Germany wants to buy 2,000,000 bales of American cotton. We can not ship it there yet. She is willing to buy it and store it in the United States until the allied powers say it can go. She wants to know that she will have it, and I think that she is entitled to it. I think that the cotton producers of the United States are entitled to let them buy this cotton and store it here. We are permitting grain and meat to go to Germany; why not cotton? Take the embargo off and let cotton go unrestrictedly to all the

allied countries, and let Germany and Austria buy cotton in the United States and store it until our Government and the other governments say she can have it. Gentlemen, that looks fair to me.

Yesterday a gentleman informed me that a friendly little country in Europe wants to buy 50,000 bales of cotton now and asked my advice where to go in order to get it—to the exchanges or where. I told him not to go to the exchanges, but to go to Memphis, Tenn., or Galveston, Tex.; to go to the spot market, buy the cotton, and have it shipped direct. I advised him not to go to these exchanges.

Gentlemen, we ask the Rules Committee of this Congress to report out this resolution of Judge CARAWAY, and let us investigate these exchanges and find out the exact truth of the situation. Why, they have got a bogus concern up there like the fellow who once sold whisky in New York. He had a café running in connection with his whisky establishment, and the law was that you could not sell whisky on Sunday except when you served food with it. So he got to serving sandwiches with a drink of whisky, and a man would go in and buy whisky. He did not want anything to eat, but they had to put something to eat on the table. So the officer would look around and glance in through the window and see if there was food on the table, and if he saw a sandwich or a piece of brown bread with a piece of ham between the slices he would pass on. And what do you suppose they did? This bartender said there was no use to go to all that expense; that the people did not eat that bread; and he hired an artist to paint him some sandwiches made out of wood. The artist painted a red streak in the middle and brown on the outside, and the policeman would look in and see something that looked like bread and would say that they were complying with the law. But when they did that they no longer called on the baker or the butcher. They were not helping that business. It was a liquor transaction purely and wholly.

I hold to-day that these exchange transactions are gambling transactions. A sample of cotton is laid upon the table, a bet is made, and no cotton is delivered in the deal, no contract is fulfilled by the delivery of actual cotton. I make the charge here and now that out of the 11,000,000 bales of cotton the New York Cotton Exchange has not supplied spinners within 12 months with 75,000 bales delivered at the mills.

Now, gentlemen, what particular purpose does that interest serve? Is it a gambling concern or is it a legitimate speculation? I think that it is a gambling concern. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am going to ask Members to study with me for a little while this proposed constitution of the world. I do not do this as an advocate, neither as one condemning the idea of a league of nations, but rather as an expositor, to study this proposed constitution of a league of nations as to the possibilities within it.

I think that all the world, and especially our country, would be glad to find a way to prevent war in the future; and, as the league of nations is a plan that has frequently been identified with our hopes, if we could find such a league to accomplish such a great desire without submitting to greater dangers probably than war, we ought certainly to do it.

I hold in my hand the proposed constitution of 26 articles of the league of nations. I have made a very careful study of it, as careful as the average student would study a draft of this sort. I think there are some features in it that are fraught with grave danger. Under this proposal the United States is to become an integral part of a league whose legislative body of delegates is undetermined in number and voting power. The covenant embraces no limitation of subject matter save as found in the first article. It designates the number to constitute the league by those which become signatory powers. Article 2 provides each member has but one vote. Article 7 provides the method of joining the league and extends the privilege to self-governing countries including dominions and colonies. This will give the United Kingdom at least five to seven times the voting power in the body of delegates that is permitted to the United States.

The executive council which is to be the real agency of the league to enforce its finding is to be limited to nine members, one each from the United States, Britain, France, Italy, and Japan, and one each from four other States to be selected by the body of delegates. The decisions of each body, delegates or executive council, are by a majority vote; so that in all cases the findings of the council will be determined by five members. In other



words any five of the nine voting together can bind the United States without its consent to any matter falling within the province of the league.

To be specific: Article 19 authorizes the league to vest mandatory authority and select the nation to exercise it over such countries recently under other sovereignties, and which are not yet regarded sufficiently stable to maintain stable self-government. This article permits by a vote of the league the necessity of the United States to undertake the maintenance of law and order in Armenia, for example, or a country in Africa. No matter what may be the wish of our own people to avoid mixing in the tangle of European or Asiatic politics any five of the nine can fix such responsibility upon us.

Any group of five of the nine can fix the character of our defensive program, as the question of the size of armament large or small of any member of the league is up to this vote by article 8.

While the preamble or covenant article pretends to limit the subject of consideration to war, it must extend without limit, as it embraces what may be considered as causes of war, to be determined by a vote of the league. This transfers the nation's sovereignty on these matters completely to a group of European nations by a mere vote to the effect that the subject in question may lead to war.

Articles 23, 24, and 25 abrogate all existing treaties between the signatory countries which by decision of the league are inconsistent with the provision of the league, and forbids any further treaty except under specific direction or in connection with the countries making up the league. This means if a treaty now exists between us and Japan inconsistent with the judgment of the league as expressed by any five of the nine, it must be abrogated. The question of European immigration will also fall under this authority, and our laws of limitation inconsistent with what a majority of this league shall find must be abrogated.

The Japanese delegation presented an amendment providing that radical discrimination should not be tolerated in immigration laws, but it was dropped for the present when other delegates urged that this would open such a large question that great delay might ensue. This interest of Japan in a sensitive question between us for many years indicates a future claim of this country. It will certainly be brought up later by Japan as a matter of interest of the league to be determined by a vote of the league in which we have but one vote.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. FESS. I regret I can not yield.

No further legislation on European or Asiatic immigration shall be enacted without the consent of the league, as it covers not only treaty making, but such laws as are based upon treaties. Can we be sure that questions of an American merchant marine will not fall under a vote of European countries, which quite naturally will prefer to keep the monopoly of this particular activity? Who will be the judge? Evidently the league will have something to say about it. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] called our attention awhile ago to the restrictive regulations by Great Britain touching the commerce leaving our shores. It appears by this practice already our merchant marine is somewhat under the control of overseas powers. This covenant increases this power.

Article 21 proposes to give to the league certain powers over the commerce of the nations making up the league. This article, read in the light of article 20, which looks to a permanent international labor bureau, will show the subtle plan of placing the matter of our own commercial standing in legislation looking to maintain American standards under a group of European countries. The moment this authority is granted we will hear Democratic free-trade politicians demand all protective legislation repealed upon the basis that to favor an American standard not reached by Europe is not within the authority of this Nation, because by this covenant we have surrendered any such authority we may have had to the findings of the league of nations, of which we are a responsible party.

The most dangerous feature of this proposed constitution of the world is the provision which makes this independent, self-developing Republic a constituent part of a league which exercises supreme authority, through a body of delegates without name or number, each of which will have equal authority in all matters which come before it with this Republic. The matters of consideration are not defined, and therefore not limited. If the Monroe doctrine is included in the judgment of a majority of the members, what recourse have we after we have entered the league, which speaks by a majority vote? If immigration is included according to a majority of the league, what is

our defense? If a tariff is included according to the judgment of the majority, what have we left to surrender or commit a breach of covenant? This Nation should never, under any circumstance, surrender its sovereignty on any questions which pertain to its future welfare to a vote of a league made up of an indeterminate number of countries whose major interests can not be expected to be identical with our own.

Article 26 purports to provide for amendment of the league. Of course, no amendment in the interests of the United States will likely ever be made, as it requires the vote of all the nine States which are represented in the council, and then the ratification of three-fourths of the States represented in the body of delegates, which must be indeterminate. If it should be claimed by the proponents of this preposterous proposition that questions I have named are not included in the league, no man of sense will deny that under article 26 amendments can be made by interested nations to include these questions.

I look upon this proposition as couched in the proposed constitution of the world which is to supersede our own authority as a Nation as monstrous, and I predict that just as soon as the American people shall grasp the vicious possibilities herein included there will be such a revolution of sentiment aroused that any man who will subscribe to this perpetual surrender of this Republic's future to a vote of foreign nations will be, as he should be, repudiated as an enemy to the spirit and genius of American institutions. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, after this war and our experience in it we ought to feel now, if never before, that Congress ought to provide for the common defense. If at the beginning of this war it had been known to the world that we had arms and munitions to arm our people; if we had had the enrollment which in old days was prescribed for the militia, and which ought to be continued now for the militia, so that we could have drafted our men without delay; if we had had educated officers to take charge of them in the field, I do not think we would have had to enter this war. No nation would have touched us or dared to do so. And my text to-day, when we have made partial preparation, and when the speeches that have been delivered on this bill tell us how defective that preparation is in some respects, and especially in artillery, what I appeal for is that we may have legislation for the common defense, which will provide that we shall not scrap what arms we have, or camps, or our enrollment, or training schools, or our factories, or our shipyards, or our merchant marine, which will carry our soldiers in case of need; that we shall not scrap the dies, jigs, and gauges which will enable us to manufacture, but so far as possible that we shall preserve our preparedness, not by a large standing army, not by conscription for long service and at great expense, but by the comparatively inexpensive plan of providing what is necessary for our boys when they are called into the field.

Legislation should also provide for an enlargement of the powers and jurisdiction of the great fortifications board, or the creation possibly of a new board which will always give pitiless publicity and annual reports of what we have and not attempt to keep it quiet, as we used to do in the past. The Nation should know whether it is really prepared.

After all previous wars we have scrapped our defense. The maintenance of preparedness and provision for the common defense during the peace that will come is a subject that should not fail to have our attention now before preparedness is gone.

The maintenance of preparedness was utterly neglected after the Civil War. At that time the soldiers went home tired of war. They would usually have little to do with the militia. Arms were sold for a song. The factories manufacturing war munitions were abandoned. Our Navy went to pieces. The fleet of monitors were our only steel vessels and were too slow. The decadence of our merchant marine had begun shortly before 1860, when we extended the "most favored nation" clause to England, and thereby abolished the differential tariff in favor of American vessels. Decline continued until our flag was almost never seen in foreign trade.

When the Spanish War broke out we had no modern field guns. We had some antiquated forts, about 300,000 Springfield rifles in only fair condition, no powder, shot, or shell, and a small Navy so ill supplied with ammunition that McKinley had to delay the war in order to obtain some sort of provision of



transports and ammunition. When that war ended I was on the Committee on Military Affairs and obtained an increase in the appropriation for rifles enough to give 100,000 annually, so that five years ago we had a million rifles on hand, though that appropriation had then been reduced, because our wise men thought that a million was enough for a first line of defense of 700,000 men. Even after the European war began it was the plan of the administration to supply artillery and munitions for only 700,000 men in the course of some seven years. During that time I was urging what has turned out to be the fact, that modern warfare is a war of nations and not of any such first line, and that the nation which can first put its forces into the field, thoroughly supplied, will be the victor. We did nothing, however, until long after we declared war, nearly three years after hostilities had begun. We then were able, after seven months, to produce modified Enfield rifles which would carry our cartridges, and to employ factories which had been manufacturing for England. We did not have the dies, jigs, gauges, and patterns to make artillery, and it was only after seven months of hesitation we adopted the French 75-millimeter field gun, which is the best in the world. We were in November, 1918, just beginning to send our artillery and munitions, and have been and are now using French guns and ammunition for our Artillery abroad.

We had begun to send heavy bombing planes, and were expecting to send scout fighting planes when the war ceased.

We have established a most magnificent system of shipbuilding, which in about four years will be able to supply the losses in merchant ships caused by submarines.

We are ready now to provide what is needed for the life of the Nation. We hope to be at peace and not at war, but we learn from Holy Writ that it is only when the strong man armed keepeth his house that his goods are in peace. War comes now like the bolt from the blue or like the day of judgment. "Be ye also ready, for ye know not what day or what hour" it cometh.

It was the duty of Congress always, as it is our duty now and not hereafter, to enact such legislation as will provide for the common defense. This was one of the main objects of the Constitution.

Under the Constitution the militia meant the whole Nation between the ages of 18 and 45, and Congress was ordered by the Constitution to provide for arming, organizing, and disciplining the militia. It was also empowered to raise armies, and a proper standing Army is necessary for the instruction of the militia and as a model for them. Congress was also given power to organize a Navy and to regulate commerce, and there is no man that does not feel that this Navy must be large enough and that commerce, if necessary, must be encouraged so as to furnish seamen, ships, and shipyards to that Navy. We can not act too soon in seeing that we are kept ready by sea and land.

I am not a militarist. It would not be possible, practical, or sensible to take our whole people away for one, two, three, or four years of their lives from productive occupations and place them in a standing army, as is done by European countries. If our boys are given military drill in their schools, if there are arms in plenty and they are taught how to shoot, and if there are plenty of officers who understand their business, it takes a comparatively short time to make soldiers out of Americans, who are always ready to do their duty with an alacrity and courage that have been the wonder and admiration of foreign nations. The United States marines had not had much drill when they and other American troops captured Belleau Wood, after throwing back the German advance across the Marne and storming a height defended by machine guns, with nothing but their rifles in their hands.

They lost 6,200 men out of the 7,800 of the marine brigade, but they captured the hill and gave new courage to the French Army, which had almost come to believe that the German attack could not be withstood. Then when a flank attack was organized by that great genius, Gen. Foch, that attack at Soissons was composed of three divisions. Two of them were American, and the center division was composed of the foreign legion, the Moroccan brigade and the Senegalese brigade. To such want of men had the French Army come that these were selected for that attack, and they went through, and the German retreat began.

It was soldiers of very limited experience that have been doing tremendous work in the Forest of Argonne, and who worked their way forward day after day against the pick of the enemy's troops until they had the whole German Army in retreat and the allied armies were ready to demand a surrender. Many wish that that attack had been continued until the German Army was captured or crushed and that there had

been no armistice, because we are not now sure that conditions of peace can be restored in central Europe except by military occupation and the protection as well as the establishment of local self-governments. It is not so sure, in the state of affairs now prevailing, that we may not have to go to Berlin yet in order to establish such governments, for if we expect indemnity we can not expect it to be paid by anarchy.

This is only by the bye. But there is no man who has seen the delay that has taken place in furnishing arms, even when we were aided by factories that had been selling to the belligerents for two years, that does not feel that we ought to provide and store enough war material to be able to respond to any call to arms within months instead of years. There is no one who has seen our difficulty in supplying officers that has not the same feeling as to the higher military education. There is no one who has seen our shortage of ships that does not feel that facilities for their production should be now maintained. All this is not a matter of large expense, but simply of retaining what we have.

Arms are the first essential when a nation is called to arms. War is the nation in arms, and to provide arms, educated officers, and a military training for the whole people is a constitutional duty. In order to "secure domestic tranquillity" it is necessary to "provide for the common defense." A rifle ready, for every man, artillery in store, school discipline, with marches and target practice, an enrolled militia, and enough West Point or other thoroughly trained graduates in civil life—these will provide an adequate army at insignificant cost which will be ready for any call to arms.

Here the hammer fell and under leave to extend Mr. PARKER of New Jersey submits the following:

I am quoting somewhat from former speeches. The topic is old but it is ever new and never more so than at present.

Let us deal with arms first. It was the duty of the United States to provide for arming the militia; that is to say, for arming the whole Nation. We may have 5,000,000 rifles on hand now. They are only one-quarter of the number we ought to have if we have to call out our able-bodied population of 20,000,000. Even for 5,000,000 men, 20,000,000 rifles would not be more than sufficient, for in modern warfare a rifle lasts about six months. As for cannon, five fieldpieces are required for every 1,000 men, and we are just beginning to furnish fieldpieces, but we have the factories and should not scrap them. This bill should provide for fieldpieces.

As to shells, we are just beginning to furnish large quantities, but we have the dies and the patterns and the factories, which would be worth nothing if thrown into the junk heap. During this present war some large factories which were making English munitions asked whether they should be preserved or whether they should be scrapped, and our Government said they did not need them and let them be scrapped. Let us see that this not repeated.

Proper legislation will provide sufficient funds, not to manufacture enormous quantities of arms at great expense at the present time, but to pay a small sum for the maintenance of these factories and for the storage of this machinery and of these patterns and models, so that we can manufacture largely on short notice. A provident government will also appropriate from time to time to increase our stores of arms and munitions. This policy will include, of course, the factories that make gun-cotton and nitrates. We do not wish to continue enormous manufacture, because explosives spoil, but we do wish to have the imperishable nitrates in sufficient store to be used in case of need and we want to maintain factories which can turn them into munitions of war. This had been the German plan for generations. Every factory was paid some small amount, sometimes for a small contract, more often simply for keeping themselves ready to do what work might be demanded. Dye works were so organized that they could be instantly changed into manufactories of explosives. The steel works kept the dies and models by which their machines could be used on cannon instead of on the weapons of peace. We now have a sufficient number of boards and officers that understand all this. We need a policy that shall be fixed by legislation whereby we can maintain that condition so as to meet any future emergency.

Above all, we should not get rid of any war matériel. It was only last year that naval guns had to be repurchased which were not of the long range desired in the Navy. We paid perhaps one hundred times as much as we sold them for, so as to use them as howitzers and for land siege guns. These naval guns were our only artillery in Europe. Springfield rifles, which were sold at \$1 apiece to Mexico, might better have been in our hands than in those of Mexicans who were shooting down our men. And the experience of modern warfare is such, especially in trench warfare, that even the long-range modern



rifle is not always so much desired as a shorter range weapon carrying a heavier bullet of greater stopping power. If old rifles were good for nothing else, they would have been good for the drilling of the Nation in the manual of arms and in target practice. Pretty good shooting can be done with those old rifles, even if they do not carry 2,000 yards. To aim at 2,000 yards is almost an impossibility, and long-range guns are dangerous for practice on an ordinary range.

This whole subject needs investigation by a special committee of Congress or by a standing commission or by both. Our fortifications board has been most useful, though somewhat slow, but a board of that character, so organized as to contain a good proportion of younger men and perhaps a few Members of the House and Senate, might give valuable information.

The most important thing of all, however, is publicity. During the Spanish War ordnance officers told me, in a whisper, that we had only between 300,000 and 400,000 Springfield rifles. Every foreign Government knew the appropriations for rifles; knew how many could be made; could easily find out how many were sold; and the knowledge which was withheld from Congress was in their possession. Above all things, therefore, the amount and character of our military stores should be yearly reported in detail to Congress and to the people. It is certain, however, that we ought to have several times the number of rifles that we have now and many times the number of field guns. The average life of any particular pattern is about 20 years, and then a new pattern comes in that is better, although the old one is good. The Springfield muzzle-loading rifle came in shortly after the Civil War. It was changed to a breech-loader, and then in about 1900 the Krag rifle was adopted. The breechloader is a good rifle yet, although the department preferred to change to the Springfield modern rifle, which is as good as any. Some changes are occasionally made in sights, and so forth, but any rifle is good enough in the hands of a good marksman. We have suffered too much from faddists who would not give us any arms because they hoped to better them.

As to cannon, it was about 20 years ago that the French adopted the new seventy-five, which has contrivances to absorb recoil and to facilitate quick aiming and which is better than perhaps any other cannon. Any gun, however, will use ammunition faster than it can be supplied and will wear out with continuous use. What we need is arms for the Nation if we have to put the Nation in arms.

The Constitution also says that the United States shall provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, by which they meant the Nation, leaving to the States the appointment of the officers and the authority of training of the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions. At that time the musket or the Kentucky rifle was the only small arm known. Every gentleman wished to be an officer, and it was preferred that the appointments should be made by the States. It is not certain that State training is a bad plan. It has never been fairly tried. The United States never furnished arms, for one thing. Switzerland leaves all training to her various cantons. Germany left each Kingdom in charge of its own forces, only providing that they should meet for inspection and maneuvers once a year, at which time ineffectives were weeded out. It should not be forgotten that the German maneuvers were practically a competitive inspection. A German officer is not appointed by the Emperor. There are military schools at which men are educated, or men who have had a college course can take their turn with the various regiments as one-year volunteers, and if they prove themselves fit are certified as fit to be appointed officers. But this certificate from the imperial authority gives no appointment whatever. The appointment comes from the officers' mess of the regiment.

Those officers have the right to select their associates. They are proud of their regiment and of its traditions; and if on the annual inspection any one of their number receives a blue envelope stating that he has failed in his duty and has been ineffective as an officer, his comrades will see to it that he resigns, so that they may be sure to obtain the credit that is due them from year to year. If he does not resign, he is simply sent to Coventry and finds it unbearable, or perhaps has to fight a duel because of some remark made as to what he has done. Each regiment is recruited from a certain district; these districts are rivals.

If an empire finds it advisable to create such a system of rivalry, it is not at all certain that the same can not be done by a republic. It is done in Switzerland. There, after school training without arms, the man joins the army, not to go into the field but to be drilled a year or two, especially in marks-

manship. He receives his rifle and his uniform and carries them home with him. He carries the rifle with him to his factory in the morning, if there is a drill in the afternoon, and I have seen 500 men come running down out of a factory, going into a room where they took their rifles and cartridge belts, falling in in the street, and starting off for an hour's march up and down the steep hills of the town. The man stands this drill and saves months of camp life. At the end of his time he goes into the reserves, but takes the rifle home with him as his own if he has done proper target practice and been certified. He keeps that rifle as his treasure, belonging to him. These men were all mobilized in this war.

Remember that all this need cost very little. In peace times a man's uniform can be provided for \$20; his rifle for \$15 more; tents, and so forth, for enough to bring it up to \$50. I think I made an estimate of other articles, artillery, and so forth, which made the total cost \$200 or \$250 for his share of the whole matériel of the Army. Less than a twentieth of our able-bodied men become 18 each year. Only 5 per cent of those liable to service would be annually provided for; and considering that the cost of a soldier in the Regular Army is at least \$1,000 a year, this method of securing a population ready to turn out on call, armed, is incomparably the cheapest of all. As America was, the Constitution provided for a nation in arms as follows:

A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

It is time that we got back to this principle of the arming of each man.

This brings us, however, to the question of how much drill and training there shall be, and whether men should be taken away from their ordinary occupations. We can not afford that now. We must supply the world with food; we must build ships to repair the losses; we must inaugurate foreign trade; we must pay the enormous debts caused by this war; and we must go to work to make the money that will enable us to do it. The wealth of the Nation lies in productive power. The nation that can produce in the greatest quantity will be the victor in any war, and this war has proved it. But there is no question that discipline and training can be had without infringing on our work.

We have common schools throughout the whole country, and it would be a simple thing to provide that every schoolboy of 14 shall be a member of the militia, and that the schools shall be furnished with arms and sufficient ammunition for target practice under proper instructors. Nearly a million men every year attain the age of 18. It would be a simple matter to provide that those boys should take a certain amount of drill if they have not taken it already in school, and should likewise be members of the active militia, say, for two years, and then be in the reserves of their companies, say, for five years more.

There are many schools and colleges that have long summer vacations. It would be simple to provide for summer camps during two months, with proper officers and drills for at least two years of their course. Pay is unnecessary. Only second-rate service is gotten for second-rate pay. The best and hardest work that is done by every student, the one in which he takes the most interest and which costs him the most money, is in the unpaid athletic games of baseball and football; and it is not impossible to have a like competition between every college and every high school, as to their efficiency in military affairs, their marks for efficiency being multiplied by the proportion of the students who are trained and participate in the contest. The same competition is possible in the militia with reference to localities. That is what is practically done in Switzerland. A contest for prizes appeals to every boy, and the greatest mistake that has taken place, not only in our militia but in our Regular Army, is that the system of competitive inspection adopted by Kitchener in India was not adopted here, except in the case of one brigade of Cavalry, wherein the inspections were made competitive by troops, and every troop received a mark, and the marks were read out at the head of the regiment at the end of the inspection.

The result in that brigade was that companies at lonely posts who had been slack in discipline and careless about their quarters were inspired with such emulation that the men were staying up at night to clean their arms and working over their quarters and horses for weeks before the inspection took place. Nothing is more simple; and after the approval and initiation of this scheme in the posts of the northwestern part of Hindustan as inaugurated by that great soldier, Kitchener, we can be sure that it is worth while. It is, I think, used in every army of any consequence in Europe, but chiefly in the citizen army of the Swiss. We have adopted it generally only as to rifle practice, and as to that my State has the pride of knowing that the New Jersey



range at Sea Girt anticipated rifle contests in the Regular Army and led to its general adoption after Army teams had gone there. What will work for rifle practice will work for other branches of military service.

Trained officers, however, are of as much importance as arms. There can be no use of the arms and no discipline of the men without officers. After the Bladensburg raid and the burning of the Capitol in the War of 1812 we realized that the want of our militia was trained officers, and we increased West Point to 250 men. We had only 5,000 men then in our Army, and many more officers were graduated than could find places in the Regular Army. Our population then was about 8,000,000. It is now 13 times that; and a West Point of proportionate size would comprise over 3,000 cadets. We have no such number there now. The advantages of the enlarged West Point were shown in the War with Mexico in 1848. Almost all of the divisions were commanded by West Pointers, often from civil life.

It was shown again in the War of 1860, when we had four years in which to train men, but except in the case of a few natural-born soldiers our chief commanders were West Point graduates. They had not usually all stayed in the Army. Meade and Lee were of the Regular Army, but Grant, Sherman, Jackson, McClellan, and a host of others were former Army officers who had gone into civil life during the long period when our Army had been small. It may perhaps be said fairly that a military officer who has seen something of civil life and has been a success there may be the best man for general command, where the arranging of large business affairs is required, as well as ordinary military knowledge.

There is no doubt that our military schools should be enlarged, either at West Point or by the establishment of other rival schools. In this present war our principal need has been officers. We have had to commission a great many by guesswork. We have gotten rid of a good many of these, and ought to have gotten rid of a good many more. On the other hand, we have set our colleges to work, and college graduates with short, intensive training have proved valuable as officers in our National Army. They have done themselves credit in France. But we had to wait for them. We had to wait for men to train the first draft, and we were in an absolute quandary how to get proper officers for the second draft. Officers had not been provided and were being provided with great difficulty, and weeded out with still more difficulty. Men who had worked fairly well in the camps were often discharged just as the troops went abroad, because they were not thought fit for foreign work.

There are many ways in which our military schools could be enlarged. We could continue student training at the various colleges. It can not be forced upon them, but they are more than willing to attempt it if they are aided with arms and officers to train the students. The organization of our staff and of our training schools has been very largely improved, and it ought not to be lost. It might be perhaps possible to allow colleges to send selected students after a three-year course to attend the last year at West Point and to graduate with the class and in competition with them on the final examination, so that the best scholars who are now assigned to the Engineers or Artillery might be selected not only from the West Point graduates but from the other schools. Any sort of competition will give some life to our military system, which is so apt to fall into a condition of dry rot and decay.

It is not necessary to have large expense for buildings. There is nothing about West Point which is to be so despised as the constant requests for costly stone buildings. There is no reason why a regiment on the frontier, if supplied with the proper officers and books, could not teach every one of the soldiers the same studies in the same way as they are taught at West Point. It might almost be said that a standing army of 100,000 men, of which a quarter should be enlisted every year, could give a four-year course of this sort to 100,000 men. Probably 18,000 would graduate each year and go into the community as reserve officers, with education given them free and with the understanding that in those regiments no one should stay after the four years unless he becomes an officer.

This may seem visionary, but nothing is visionary after the experiences of this war, in which our colleges and schools and our officers' training schools have graduated officers by precisely this process, although in the officers' schools they have not enforced the rigorous hardships of discipline which prevail in a regular army and originally prevailed at West Point. Such an army would not need penalties against desertion. The man who did not keep up or did not obey orders would be discharged and another man would take his place, to obtain the benefit of this thorough education in sciences and languages. And it costs no more to give that sort of education than it does to keep the man

as an ordinary soldier, except that there must be a few more officers as instructors.

But we must have officers, and the various systems of training officers that have been established should be the last thing to be abandoned. The graduates in peace times are not needed in the standing army, but they are a reserve for an army, ready to go to train their fellow countrymen whenever they are needed. They would become teachers in our public schools and colleges, and be able to train the students without expense to the Government. They would become officers of our militia, and it is fair to the militia to say that if they had good officers they would have been always a very much better force than they have been. The men have always been willing, but the officers have often been ignorant.

All this is a matter which must be dealt with by the administration under legislation that should give authority to appropriate for these various purposes, while appropriations should be made from time to time, governed by the good sense of Congress, after reports of the administration and of any commission that might be appointed, to govern and perpetuate the system.

Enrollment is the basis of any national system. It was hard to make our enrollment, but it will be easy to keep it up. It is important that the lists be not thrown away, that copies be kept in the localities, and that every man who becomes 18 shall be added to the list. This was the law of the United States from May 8, 1792, when the first militia act was passed, until the passage of the Dick bill some 20 years ago. The first section of that act provided:

Each and every free, able-bodied white male citizen of the respective States, resident therein, who is or shall be of the age of 18 years and under the age of 45 years, except as hereinafter excepted, shall severally and respectively be enrolled in the militia by the captain or commanding officer of the company within whose boundaries such citizen shall reside.

By section 6 the adjutant general of the State was—

To receive from the several officers of the different corps throughout the State returns of the militia under their command, reporting the actual situation of their arms, accoutrements, and ammunition, their delinquencies, and every other thing which relates to the general advancement of good order and discipline. \* \* \* From which returns he shall make proper abstracts, and lay the same annually before the commander in chief of the State.

And by the act of March 2, 1803, he was to make returns of the militia of the State, and so forth, as above, to the President of the United States annually or before the first Monday in January in each year.

Muster day was really observed in the United States for more than half a century. We must return to the wisdom of our fathers in maintaining a complete system of enrollment. It will not be hard to maintain such a system. If the States desire to avoid expense it would be perfectly simple for them to provide by law that no one should vote until he had performed his two years' service in the militia and had an honorable service. This would simplify the difficulties and expense with reference to registry for elections and really save money.

Camps, camp grounds, and barracks must not be scrapped, but maintained and preserved. During the Spanish War our principal difficulty was to find camp grounds near the principal cities and centers of population where the men could be assembled and drilled. We have had the same trouble to a much larger extent in the present war. In the early days there were many forts established in central locations on healthy ground where troops could have been assembled, as, for example, Baton Rouge, Perth Amboy, Omaha, and many other places, and the lack of those grounds was greatly felt in this war. These grounds in time of peace afford the whole neighborhood large public parks for recreation when they are not used for military purposes. We have a number of national parks at the present day—Chickamauga is the most notable—where troops were assembled during the war, and if the costly system of separate park commissions were abandoned and all these parks were placed under the management of the Secretary of War the cost of maintenance would be small.

The cantonments which have been built will be useful for the exercises of the militia and will save expense. Some of the buildings will be valuable as armories for the large quantity of war matériel which a prudent nation ought to keep on hand, and the keepers of those armories could watch over the other buildings in the camp without extra cost. But we should especially avoid the waste of Government property which has taken place under the existing statutes, whereby the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are eager to get a little money in by selling arms which they deem to be obsolete, scrapping vessels and machinery, and transferring military camps which are not in use to the Secretary of the Interior to be sold for a song in order that speculators may make profits by dividing them up into lots.



Even the Post Office bill just passed orders the War Department to give up road-making tools.

If the jurisdiction of the Fortifications Commission should be enlarged so as to include all war matériel and proper publicity enforced as to what we have on hand, so that we could see whether our military resources were increasing or diminishing in proportion to our population, there would be less danger of the raids on our national military and naval resources which are made from time to time. This war has proved that there is not a single weapon that will use a percussion cap that has not come back into use. Boat howitzers and muzzle-loading cannon are revived in the trench and Stokes mortars. The saber, sword, and bayonet, that were deemed obsolete a few years ago, all find their use now. Even the lance has its advocates in foreign cavalry.

The forts which become valueless for purposes of defense have become of the utmost value when their underground bombproof tunnels were used as storage places for arms, ammunition, and provisions. Verdun, though no longer used as a fort, contained supplies and supply shops 40 feet underground for 300,000 men. Governors Island is no longer a fort, but it is an essential naval and military depot, where troops can be housed before shipment by sea. We now have buildings, grounds, and room enough to store our military matériel and add to it. Let us pass laws which will see that this shall be done. Do not scrap our camps and camp grounds.

The sea is the heritage of the descendants of nations that dwell on the shores of the Baltic and Mediterranean. Communication by sea is as important as ever, and the nation that owns the means of communication has the control of the world and can feed its people and supply its navy with trained seamen. We have restored American power upon the sea, not only in our Navy, but in the merchant ships that we are building and manning. We must maintain that new creation, and it will not be easy to do so, because in time of peace the cost of running vessels from the tramp to the ocean liner depends so largely upon the wages of the men that are employed in that vessel that Americans will not go to sea unless they receive much higher wages than in other nations. Conditions have changed. In olden times, when pirates infested the ocean, every ship was an adventure, and our whalers and traders sailed as independent ships, with not only a captain but a ship's husband on board, who directed the voyage for the profit not only of the owners but also usually of the crew, for often every man in that crew had an interest in that voyage.

This sort of work was agreeable to the American, who does not care to be a common sailor on a ship plying from port to port, where the crew are discharged at the end of every voyage and where there is no chance of advancement, with hardships such as are not known on shore.

Our laws, which require certain things to be done for every sailor, have made the management of ships so costly that American ships got off the sea. Merchant shipping was carried on by the Germans and French as part of their military system, with sailors obtained by conscription, whose service took the place of military service. In England the vessels came to be manned very largely, and more and more from year to year, by Lascars, Chinamen, Japanese, and all the nations of the earth. England was able to depend upon her large fishing fleets and trawlers, which have really given her the victory in this war by searching out mines and submarines and putting down piracy. We have had no such reserve, but have had to build vessels for the purpose. We have had to commit the most awful waste of public money in establishing shipyards where ships are turned out on standard designs, with the various parts made in different factories throughout the United States, but at prices that never would be repaid by ordinary work in times of peace after freights shall be lower. There is a scarcity of ships now, and though ships will be able to run at a profit with the present rates charged for the carrying of goods, this can not be expected to last, and it is for us now to enact wise legislation by which the building, owning, and operation of ships manned by Americans and commanded by Americans shall be preserved.

There are several means by which this can be done. We can not use conscription for this purpose. It is foreign to the genius of our institutions and would never be submitted to except in case of necessity, as has been the case during this war.

We can use subsidies based upon carrying the mails or upon the number of miles traveled and the amount of freight carried or the speed of the vessels. To a limited extent this ought to be done by general law; but subsidies are such a fruitful source of graft and corruption that they are unpopular, and deservedly so. These subsidies would not be settled by the board called lords of trade and plantations, as they are in

England, or of some shipping board, as they are on the Continent, and if we established such boards they could hardly be controlled and would be sure to be abolished. What is needed is some continuous policy which will tempt Americans to go to sea. The really successful policy, once adopted by the United States, was that of granting a rebate of part of the duties upon all goods brought in by American vessels. There are treaties which prevent this, but in the present time of readjustment of all treaties throughout the whole world these clauses ought to be denounced and put to an end and that old system ought to be reestablished. There can be no doubt of this. The rebate is fair, because everyone can get the advantage of it, and it leaves travel by sea open to competition as before.

Another scheme in which I have had great interest was one that I brought once before the Naval Board of the United States. It would have cost at that time about \$3,000,000 a year. It would cost more now, but at that time they were unwilling to spend that little money. My suggestion was that if the shipowners were paid the difference between the wages of American seamen and officers and those of foreigners—Lascars and Chinamen—they could afford to run their vessels. The subsidy would be based upon men, and justly so, because wages in America are higher. A freight subsidy is likely to become exorbitant, because what is necessary in the beginning to enable ships to run will not be necessary afterwards when larger vessels are obtained. A subsidy based on speed would have been granted a few years ago for a 15-knot vessel, and now it ought only to be granted for a 25-knot vessel.

A subsidy based on carrying the mails is to a certain extent a sham, because it is much more than the cost of carrying the mails and is a mere favor to certain favored lines. But if it were the law that every shipowner should receive a certain amount per month for every officer and seaman employed by him, who had stood his training in the Navy and enlisted in the Naval Reserve, so as to be subject to the call of his country in time of war, the result would be that the shipowner would be paid the difference between the wages of foreigners and the wages of the Americans, while every American seaman would go proudly to the shipping office, exhibiting his certificate of enrollment in the reserve and the proper service in the Navy, and insisting that he should be paid proper wages because of the amount to be received by the shipowner.

This is entirely different from the ordinary scheme of Naval Reserve, by which the man is to be paid a very small amount for enrollment in the reserve, and the reserve is soon composed of loafers alongshore who do not go to sea at all. The reason for this was that shipowners did not like to employ a Naval Reserve man who has to go away occasionally to stand a month's training in the Navy. This difficulty could be avoided by providing that any man after a year's service in the Navy should be entitled to the rating that he had there obtained. If he desired to increase his rating he would have to go and stand a further examination. The officers would, of course, have to pass examinations and be enrolled as officers in the Naval Reserve. This system has been adopted in the most wonderful fashion in the present war. The transport officers and crews are now enrolled in our Navy as naval reserves. It only needs a continuation of this policy in time of peace to establish the personnel, but their payment must be secured so that they may get proper wages, either by subsidy—best, I think, founded upon man power—or by differential duties, such as existed in the past. We can build ships in America as cheaply as anywhere in the world. We have the machinery, the coal, the steel, and now we have the shipyards, and ships would be built by private enterprise if it can only be made profitable to run them.

Our shipyards should be kept up by the Government. They have been established and connections made therewith at large expense. Little can be got for them if they are scrapped or sold and diverted to other uses. There is no reason why this should be done. Of course, shipbuilding should be by private enterprise, but those yards could be let at proper rents, adjustable from time to time, to private builders. It would pay the Government to let them for nothing except maintenance, if we can only keep up the shipbuilding of the United States. This war has proven that in time of war we must depend upon ourselves for our production of ships, as well as in all other matters. The old doctrine, which had been so long forgotten, that we must so control our industries in peace that we shall be independent of every other nation in time of war is still good. This doctrine has been revived by all modern political economists, who have found that it was a delusion and a snare to cry, "Peace, peace," when there might be no peace. This doctrine is especially applicable to the United States. We have been



allied in this conflict with the nation which commanded the seas, but in any future conflict it might not be so. We might have to depend upon ourselves, and it should be a cardinal maxim that if we desire to maintain our independence we should be able to produce every necessary, whether for the support of our population or the supply of our armies or the defense of our rights at sea.

Let us not scrap preparedness.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I felt called upon to criticize some of the methods of the War Department in regard to the infamous system of courts-martial that were being held in our armies. In the course of those remarks I criticized somewhat severely Gen. Ansell, who had been acting as Judge Advocate General. Facts that have come to my attention since that time have led me to believe that I was perhaps too harsh in that criticism. I have received a letter from Gen. Ansell, and the gentleman who handed that letter to me stated that I was at liberty to place it in the RECORD. This letter shows much of the activity of Gen. Ansell in trying to reform that infamous system.

It always gives me pleasure when I have done even a partial injustice to anyone, to admit that fact, or make reparation. I do not believe, however, that even from the letter of Gen. Ansell itself that he has been entirely blameless. He shows in the letter that he did make his appeal to Gen. Crowder, to the Chief of Staff, and to the Secretary of War, urging the correction of the system that had grown up, and which he thought, and which I think beyond question, they had the right to revise and change. He shows that he tried to secure reconsideration in a number of cases, and was overruled. But, Mr. Chairman, my reason for now criticizing him—not so harshly as before—is that, as he knew, that those iniquities were being perpetrated, that those outrages were being committed, he ought to have notified those who were his superior officers and responsible for them that he intended to resign unless such abuses were corrected. Not having done so, I feel that he has not placed himself entirely outside the pale of just and legitimate criticism.

I know what the answer will be. The answer will be that during that time we were at war, and that is true, and that may be a partial mitigation; but we were at war when Senator CHAMBERLAIN bravely dared to criticize conditions in the military camps of this country. Attempts were made to call him down. It was even said by high authority that he had forced the Secretary of War to lose his valuable time in going before the committee of the Senate for the purpose of making explanations. But, Mr. Chairman, though that brave Senator may go down to defeat, I believe he will carry with him the blessings of many mothers of soldiers in this country whose lives he saved by that very criticism, because he brought about at least a partial reform in the infamous conditions that existed in the camps. If that action on the part of that brave Senator shall forever retire him to the shades of private life, he will carry with him the consciousness of having saved human lives from the work of heartless tyrants. And I believe that if Gen. Ansell had then said to the War Department, "Unless these things are changed, unless these savageries are discontinued, unless these barbarous and inhuman cruelties are stopped, I will resign my position and expose to the world just what has been going on," I believe it would have had its effect in getting a correction of those conditions.

He would no doubt have been threatened with court-martial; but if the War Department had permitted that outrage, the country would have arisen in such just protest that the threat would never have been executed.

A brave man may be suppressed for a time, but the conscience of honest people, shocked by atrocity and barbarism, will rise to his vindication, and the cowards who seek his destruction will in the end be driven from the seat of power. The wicked and heartless may flourish for a season, but that justice which has its seat in the bosom of God will finally overtake them. It seems from the letter of Gen. Ansell that whenever he tried to treat soldiers like human beings he was called down and overruled. Then how could he remain in the councils of such Huns? How could he herd with such Attilas?

Mr. Chairman, as he suggests, I was no doubt too harsh in the criticism, and I feel that it is due to me and to this House and to the country that I should read the statement of Gen. Ansell, and thus pillory the Neros responsible for these cruelties before the country.

Only yesterday I received a letter from the War Department in regard to a court-martial sentence that had been brought to my attention. I had placed before them a case where it was stated to me that a young man had, as I thought, been most

cruelly sentenced to 20 years at Fort Leavenworth. The reply was that they could not reopen the case now, because more than six months had expired since he made application for clemency, and clemency had been denied. The letter stated that a re-examination at the present time is precluded under War Department orders of August 28, 1907, which prohibit the reexamination of application for clemency within six months of the last consideration, unless new and material reasons therefor are presented. Is that the system under which people in a Christian land, in a civilized country, have to live? Is it possible that the War Department has so tied itself down by inflexible rules that although a most outrageous sentence has been fixed upon a soldier because it has been six months since clemency had been asked and denied, they could not reopen the case? The letter pointed out that the 18th of May, 1919, was as early as he could make another application. Hindenburg and Kaiser Bill could hardly be more cruel. The letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 17, 1919.

HON. JOHN L. BURNETT,  
House of Representatives.

SIR: I regret to have observed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 14 that upon that day, during the debate on the Army bill in the House, you took occasion to make a bitter attack upon me, based upon your gratuitous assumption that I had made no effort to prevent or correct the prevalent injustices of courts-martial administration; and it was with even greater regret, if of greater regret I could be sensible, I observed that your attack upon me evoked the applause of your colleagues.

Despite the intemperance of your remarks, and notwithstanding that you based them upon the purest assumption which the slightest investigation would have shown, even if my present attitude had not satisfactorily indicated, to be the very opposite of the truth, I shall assume, for the present at least, that you do not intend to do me a grievous wrong; that you do not wish to take advantage of your official position to my great injury; and I shall assume, in fairness to you, that the highly objectionable character of your remarks is due to the fact that you spoke out of an outraged sense of justice, and that you want to be fair, and can be fair, and will be fair even now.

If I am justified in indulging this presumption you will permit me to show you, and you will be glad to be shown and to be able to acknowledge, that your attack upon me was as baseless as it was bitter.

Your initial statement was as follows:

"Gen. Ansell, when he made the statement credited to him in the Washington Post to-day, showed that he himself was a party to the crime. Any man who would sit by as an assistant judge advocate general and see men convicted under the circumstances that Gen. Ansell detailed must either be a coward or an incompetent weakling. [Applause.]

"Now, there is no use talking about it. I think he stated facts about it, and there have been committed the enormities and atrocities by men on courts-martial which have been winked at by Crowder, and perhaps by the Secretary of War himself. These outrages are only equalled by the atrocities that the Huns themselves committed. It is infamous. The statement of Ansell shows the wickedness in the War Department among these petty officers, some of whom no doubt were men from civil life who never made \$50 or \$100 a month, and who tried men and sent them to Leavenworth Penitentiary for years, and yet the men higher up of this department are the ones who are responsible and ought either to be impeached or court-martialed themselves."

And when reminded by another Member that you were doing me an injustice you continued to say:

"Why did he not appeal to Gen. Crowder, why did he not appeal to the President to vindicate him, why did he go on here until he was called before a committee of the Senate to do it? Now, if he had been a brave man and an honest man, he never would have held the place that he held with these atrocities and wickedness being perpetrated by men in high life. You can not get around it, gentlemen. He is a party to the crime; there is no doubt about it. \* \* \* Those things are done, gentlemen. But who has done it? Gen. Ansell is responsible; Crowder and the whole bunch of them; Crowder, no doubt, more than any of them. Do not try to throw it on one man, but hold the whole lot of them responsible. Let the responsibility fall where it ought to fall, gentlemen, and not upon any one man."

I shall speak by the record and tell you, in part at least, of the efforts made by me since the beginning of this war to correct a situation which I believe, and which you with bitterness have proclaimed, to have produced injustice. It is not my purpose to assert that my views were right; it is my sole purpose to show you that I did not "sit back," inactive, without attempting to prevent and remedy a course of administration which is now generally conceded to have resulted in injustice to the enlisted men of the Army.

In the first place, I think I may appropriately say in this connection that throughout my service I have not been able to accept the view that our military code sufficiently establishes the rights of an enlisted man before a court-martial, or that our procedure is sufficiently protective of those rights, or that there is no reason or necessity for authoritative supervision of the procedure of courts-martial, and of revision of their judgments. Such a view I have ever rejected, as all those will attest who have been most closely associated with me in the performance of my legal duties in the Army.

In and out of season, whenever opportunity has offered, and at times with an insistence which has strained, if not transgressed, the military proprieties, I have labored to the end that courts-martial might come to be legally established and universally regarded and respected as courts administering law according to fixed and established principles of jurisprudence; that is, as courts of justice. Such was my attitude as early as 1901. Throughout my instructorship at West Point, from 1902 to 1909, I labored to that end; and the whole course of my conduct as a judge advocate has been marked by a desire to liberalize the harsh features of our military methods and subject them, to the greatest practicable extent, to those guarantees that guard an accused on trial in a civil forum. When, by virtue of seniority, I came to the head of this office in September, 1917, while my chief was engaged in the performance of his duties as Provost Marshal General, I knew that with this new and large citizen Army we should have need of the closest legal supervision of courts-martial pro-



cedure and judgments, and I envisioned the great difficulties that must result from a continuation of our old-established methods.

At the outbreak of the war the state of the law was, as the department had for years construed it, that the judgment of a court-martial once approved by the officer in the field appointing it was final and unmodifiable; that no matter how gross and prejudicial and palpable the errors of law in the proceedings as shown upon the face of the record, there was no power in the department or elsewhere to modify, reverse, or set the judgment aside. This was the crux of the difficulty. There was no authority whatever with power to correct for prejudicial errors of law. If this were true, then, indeed, as was said by those in the department who have opposed me during this agitation, is "a military camp the fittest field of application of the military code." The camp commander's will and view become the touchstone of legality; there can be no such thing as established legal control over courts-martial and courts-martial proceedings; no means of correcting their judgments, however unlawful and however unjust. When I became the senior present for duty in the office in the early days of the war I saw, or at least I thought I saw, the necessity of breaking up such a static and intolerable legal situation, and proceeded to act accordingly. During this war I have made the following efforts, among other innumerable ones in individual cases, to that end:

(a) On October 18, 1917, I had the office begin a study to determine whether the power of revision of courts-martial judgments and the incidental power of a close and corrective supervision over their procedure could not be found in existing law.

(b) On November 10 I completed and submitted to the Secretary of War for his personal consideration a formal office opinion which held, with all my associates concurring, that such a power had been conferred upon the Judge Advocate General of the Army, by virtue of 1199 Revised Statutes of the United States.

(c) I immediately proceeded to revise courts-martial judgments, and on the very first day under the opinion I set aside several sentences on the ground of their illegality.

(d) I immediately took steps to establish in the office a court of revision and to consider the drafting of regulations to govern it.

(e) The Judge Advocate General, who was then Provost Marshal General and who up to this time had been without active connection with this office, thereupon returned to this office, wrote and filed with the Secretary of War a brief in opposition, and held that there was no such power of revision, and urged the reversal of my opinion and my action.

(f) The Secretary of War, for the time being at least, agreed with the Judge Advocate General, as did also the Acting Chief of Staff and the Inspector General of the Army, who apparently had been called into conference.

(g) Thereupon I was relieved of my duties in connection with the administration of military justice, and these were taken over by the Judge Advocate General in person. Consequently, from the middle of November, 1917, to the middle of July, 1918, I was not charged with any duty or responsibility in connection with the administration of military justice, nor was I consulted either by the Secretary of War or the Judge Advocate General upon matters affecting the administration of military justice.

(g) About this time, also, an order which had previously been issued with the concurrence of the Judge Advocate General and the Chief of Staff, under 1132 Revised Statutes, empowering me to take full charge of the office and its policies, was revoked.

(h) On December 11, 1917, I asked the Secretary of War for a suspension of his decision and that I be permitted to file an extended brief in support of my views and the office opinion. This permission was granted. The brief was filed with the Secretary. As indicating its character, the following were its several points:

I. The action taken by the Secretary of War on the advice of the Judge Advocate General has been taken under very evident misapprehension. Such action is predicated upon the correctness of conviction; and the acceptance of such an act of grace by these innocent men necessarily implies a confession of guilt of a crime, which upon well-established principles of law and justice they never committed. Justice is a matter of law and not of executive favor.

II. It is as regrettable as it is obvious that those who oppose my views do not vision in the administration of military justice what the new Army of America will require, nor do they even see what the present is revealing; they are looking backward and taking counsel of a reactionary past whose guidance will prove harmful if not fatal.

(1) The views of the Assistant Chief of Staff and the Inspector General savor of professional absolutism.

(2) The opposing legal views are anachronistic. They are given a backward slant through undue deference to the theory of an illustrious text writer as to the nature of courts-martial, a theory which civil jurisprudence has never adopted but distinctly denied.

(3) The teachings which followed upon the premise that courts-martial are executive agencies have all been disproved by the Supreme Court of the United States, though this department still clings to them.

III. The whole argument of the other side is found in the contention that the word "revise" has no substantial meaning, but has reference only to clerical corrections.

One single fact exposes the utter fallacy of that contention, and had it been considered must have prevented an expression of that view.

That fact is this: The word "revise" is an organic word, which solely creates and defines the duties of an entire bureau. Congress went to the great length of creating an independent bureau in the War Department for the sole and declared purpose of having it "revise" the proceedings of all military courts, and made that duty of revision the sole duty of that bureau.

IV. "Revise" in its every sense—ordinary, legal, and technical military sense—means to correct, to alter, and amend.

V. The word "revise," as a matter of fact, is in no sense ambiguous, and there is no room for misconstruing it. It would have made no difference, therefore, what the administrative practice was or is. The quality of law is not impaired by nonuse. As a matter of fact, Judge Holt did, in form at least, pronounce sentences invalid, and did not content himself simply with recommending that pronouncement was by superior authority. His views as to the validity of proceedings were expressed in terms that savor of judicial pronouncement, and the orders of the War Department so far as examined seem to respect that quality by confirmation.

VI. The Judge Advocate General of England certainly did have this power of revision. I am not advised of his present authority.

VII. Whence comes the established power to declare proceedings null and void for jurisdictional error? And why should not the larger power include the lesser radical one of correction of legal error?

VIII. The necessity, in the name of justice, of locating this power in this department and preferably in this office, where logically and, I

think, legally it belongs, must be apparent to all who are familiar with the administration of military justice.

(hh) The Judge Advocate General filed a brief in opposition to my second brief, which was to the point that the power did not exist and to the effect that the military code should better be left to be administered by the camp commander.

(i) The Secretary of War again held with the Judge Advocate General that the power was not to be deduced by the existing law, and directed him, not me, to make a "study" of the situation regarding revisory powers.

(j) About this time 13 negro soldiers were hanged in Texas almost immediately upon the completion of their trial and without review of their cases. Indeed, the proceedings under their cases did not reach the department until probably some three months after they had been executed. I took this occasion to file a memorandum with the Judge Advocate General to show what was happening and what was always likely to happen if he and the Secretary of War adhered to their views.

(k) The Judge Advocate General recommended and the department finally adopted an administrative method known as General Order 7, which suspended certain sentences until the proceedings could be examined in this office and the commanding general advised with. This was an administrative palliative which was described by the Judge Advocate General as necessary to head off a "threatened congressional investigation," to "silence criticism," "to prevent talk about the establishment of courts of appeal," and to make it "apparent that an accused did get some kind of revision of his proceedings other than the revision at field headquarters."

(l) I volunteered to criticize this compromise with the law and justice and again asked that revisory power be established in this office. I recommended that if the administrative method was nevertheless to be adhered to, it should be greatly extended.

(ll) It was upon my voluntary recommendation that a branch of this office was established in France, to make such review as departmental administration permitted.

(m) Several times—three times, I think—during January, February, March, and April, 1917, I called attention to the necessity of closer supervision of courts-martial judgments and proceedings.

(n) Returning from Europe in the middle of July, whither I had gone the April before for the purpose of studying the military administration of our allies, I filed with the Judge Advocate General a report which, among other things, treated especially of the administration of military justice in France, Italy, and England, and which indicated those elements of their systems which I believed to be better than our own, and suggested our own weaknesses. This report never reached the Secretary of War.

(o) In August, 1918, I reorganized the office so as to be enabled to present a more thorough presentation of the deficiencies of the court-martial records coming to the office, and by strength and thoroughness of argument, to impel the minds of the military authorities to action in individual cases. For this purpose I created the boards of review, which still exist and perform most valuable service, but without any authority to make a modification of a judgment in any case.

(p) In September, I ordered the Boards of Review to break away from the office interpretation (which, however, was probably correct) of the administrative method heretofore referred to (subpar. k), which had been construed to forbid this office to make any recommendation or suggestion as to clemency. And I ordered that, in a proper case, despite the order, clemency should be suggested to commanding generals.

(q) In September, upon my insistent recommendation, power was established in the Acting Judge Advocate General in France to make rulings upon matters of the administration of military justice, in our own forces in France, which would control all commanding generals until overruled by the Secretary of War. This is now being opposed by the commanding general American Expeditionary Forces and my own action and propriety in procuring the issue of this order is being subjected to question.

(r) In October, the Executive Officer and I advocated (and the head of the office approved) the increase of the personnel of the department, so that at least the trial judge advocate should be a lawyer and could use his power as such to exert some legal control over the court.

Upon every occasion and every opportunity I have stood for an absolute legal supervision of courts-martial procedure and judgments, and even when not charged with any duty touching the administration of military justice, I have never hesitated to express my view upon any matter concerning it that might come to my attention. In certain several cases involving sentences of death, I voluntarily went to the chief of this office and opposed his recommendation for execution.

These are a part of my efforts. I hope they may serve to convince all fair-minded men that I am not a coward or weakling.

You seem to think that under these circumstances I should have gone directly to the President. Upon a little reflection you will appreciate, I am sure, the impossibility of such a course. I think, however, that, resting under the charge which you have made against me, I am justified in saying this, that on one occasion I well remember—and doubtless there are others—when four sentences of death were pending in the department for confirmation, and when this office had recommended execution, I went to the head of the office and orally presented to him my views in opposition. I then filed with him a memorandum in which I did my best to show, what seemed to me to be obvious, that these men had been most unfairly tried, had not been tried at all, and ought not to die or suffer any other punishment upon such records. Discovering that these memoranda had not been presented to the Secretary of War, and feeling justified by the fact that I had no other forum in this department, I gave a copy of the memorandum to a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee of the House and was told by him that he would present the cases to the President himself.

I was compelled to do this—an act inconsistent with strict military propriety—by the dictates of my own conscience, by my desire to serve justice, and by my sense of duty to my God and these unprotected men that their lives might be spared.

Very respectfully, yours,

S. T. ANSELL.

WASHINGTON, February 17, 1919.

MR. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS].

MR. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, Gen. Ansell has recognized the injustice that has been done thousands and tens of thousands of private soldiers during this war. These wrongs have been committed in the name of justice through the medium of a military



trial. He has come to this Congress and asked us to revise the military laws under which it is made possible for these wrongs to be inflicted on the enlisted man. If any Member of Congress will take the time and has the inclination to go to the War Department and investigate these alleged courts-martial, he will come back to his seat in this House denouncing in most unmeasured terms the military law under which the enlisted men have been tried during this war and are still being tried.

We ought not to forget that we still have under arms more than two millions of men. Each one is subject to trial by court-martial upon the charge of violating some frivolous and absurd military rule. I will venture to guess that none of you can read the hearings in the average court-martial but will say that justice is an absolute stranger at these so-called trials.

If we adjourn this Congress and leave Gen. Ansell and other officers who want to help him with their hands tied, I do not know what may be the result. If the worst should follow, the responsibility will be at the door of Congress, because we have refused to heed his cry of danger.

In this connection I am going to read to you an excerpt from a letter received from the mother of one of these boys who is somewhere in Europe. The mother says:

I am inclosing you herewith a letter that I have received from my son. Can't these boys be brought home?

I am thinking that this thought is in the heart of many mothers to-day. I will read now a paragraph from the son's letter which was inclosed:

This is the worst hole that I ever got into. I sleep on a board floor, as does each private. The officers are well fed while we starve. They have good beds in good quarters. If we complain, we get a court-martial. I have not been up before them yet. Don't know how soon I will be.

Here follows a warning in this letter that every Member of Congress ought to heed. Listen to the voice of this boy as it comes from over the sea. Here is his closing sentence in this paragraph:

One thing, a time will come when the boys are home, and these officers may never know who got them.

Mr. FERRIS. Does the gentleman think that is a good spirit for the boy to write?

Mr. KEARNS. I am not discussing the spirit of this letter. I am stating a cold fact. I have sympathy for a boy put in this position, where he is made to sleep on a bare floor and the officer is furnished with comfortable quarters and well fed while the boy is being starved. I say most emphatically my sympathy is with the boy.

Mr. FERRIS. Does the gentleman's sympathy extend to the threat to assassinate the officer?

Mr. KEARNS. Of course I have no sympathy with anarchy or lawlessness in any form, but I have read to this House the language of a boy who says he has been made to suffer untold and useless hardships. He says if he complains because he is starving he is brought before a court-martial. Under our present system of courts-martial the chances are he would receive many years at hard labor in prison. To my mind, the entire system is wrong and the hardship of these boys would appeal to a heart of adamant. The only argument that I am trying to advance is the argument that we, this Congress, should act; that we should do something before we adjourn to relieve these boys. No; I am not upholding anarchy, neither do I subscribe to any veiled threat that might be expressed between the lines of the paragraph taken from this letter, whatever that threat may be. I believe in law and order; but I am telling you that these antiquated laws should be repealed. They have come down the centuries from the Dark Ages. We have tried to rewrite these laws here on two or three occasions within the week by way of amendment to the military appropriation bill, but each time some one made a point of order to the amendment. We wanted to rewrite these laws so that boys would not be compelled to make threats against officers, if indeed they make threats. We wanted to make the enlisted man's liberty just as sacred and as safe as your liberty and mine.

I want to say to you that there is not one private out of one hundred who is tried by a court-martial who stands a ghost of a chance of acquittal if an officer is the prosecuting witness. In support of this statement let me read to you from an argument made by a young officer in defense of his client. Before I do that, and by way of explanation, permit me to say that three officers had testified against the defendant who was a private. When these officers had finished their testimony the prosecution rested its case. The young lieutenant who was defending the boy did not put his client on the stand, nor did he put any witness on the stand. Here I call your attention to the reason, as he said, why he did not. Let me say in praise of the young lieutenant who defended this private that he had nerve sufficient to talk straight out from the shoulder to the court. He had the nerve to tell them the situation, the environ-

ment in which he found himself in the defense of his client. Listen to the language that he defiantly slings into the very teeth of the court, composed, I think, of about seven officers. And note, too, the silence of the court when, if this statement that follows is not true, the officer making the accusation should have been himself brought to trial. Yet there are high Army officers here in Washington who will tell you this situation does not exist. Listen to the first paragraph of this argument, and then tell me what you think. The language hurled at the court was as follows. Listen to it:

If the court please, I will take up a few minutes this morning of your time in order to sum up the evidence. I will deal mostly with the evidence of Capt. Williams, the man who prepared the charges and on whose account we are assembled here this morning. I did not allow the defendant to take the stand in his own behalf—

Let me pause here and ask, Why do you suppose he did not? I want you to listen to the reason why he says he did not allow his client to take the stand in his own behalf to rebut the testimony of the three officers. This is what he says:

I did not allow the defendant to take the stand in his own behalf because I realize that the words of an officer are above reproach (with this court) and that any evidence that the defendant might be able to give would simply be a waste of time.

This is the first paragraph in the speech made by the counsel for the defendant, and yet officers here in Washington will tell you that what I am saying is not true; yet I have quoted from the record of a military trial wherein the defendant was found guilty and sentenced to imprisonment for eight years at hard labor, and all because an officer's word in a military court "is above reproach." All because it would be "a waste of time" to offer testimony of a private soldier in a military court. I say this is disgraceful; this is shameful, and this Congress ought to deal military autocracy a death blow while we have this chance. Gen. Ansell has defied this military aristocracy and is begging us to act. Here is a young lieutenant, M. P. O'Keefe, defending a private and has the nerve to say to the court that he did not put his client on the witness stand because he realized that the word of a private was worthless in a military court as against the word of an officer, and the court sat there and listened to the charge in silence, and by that silence, as we all know, admitted that every word that Lieut. O'Keefe said was true. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER].

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I shall address my remarks to some of the results flowing from the activities of war rather than to questions of preparation or plans for offense or defense. What I am about to say I know is a matter of great importance to thousands and thousands of men who are returning home, who are crippled, and I believe it will be of interest generally to the people throughout the country. Some weeks ago I called the attention of the House to the inadequate compensation provided by the war-risk insurance law for the soldiers who have become crippled and maimed in the great war just closing. At the time of the passage of the law I called the attention of the House to this lame place in the law and asserted on the floor on several occasions that it appeared that the draftsmen of the act had lopped off the pensions to the blind, the legless, the armless, the man who had lost one leg and one arm, for the purpose of increasing the compensation to be paid other beneficiaries to be provided for in the act. I suppose it was done to round out the symmetrical conception or scheme of some sociologic dreamer. The compensation provided by the act for the man who had lost an arm and a leg, who has no wife or child living, is an insult and a burning shame. Under article 3 of the war-risk insurance law this man is given a percentage of the compensation for a total permanent disability. That sum is \$30 per month. Under the general pension law the man who has lost an arm and a leg is entitled to a pension of \$60 per month. The Civil War veteran receives \$60 a month, the Spanish War veterans receive \$60 a month, and the soldier of this war who has lost an arm and a leg would have received \$60 a month if the war-risk insurance law had not been enacted. The law unfairly discriminates against the crippled soldier. It is unfortunate that we use the word "compensation" in the act instead of the word "pension."

To my mind there is much more to be considered than the mere physical impairment to earning a living. These injuries that I refer to in the main have been received upon the field of conflict, in the performance of acts of heroism, and the mutilated condition of the soldier should be taken into consideration when we arrive at the reward that an appreciative and rich nation decrees for him. There can be no such thing as compen-



sation to the man who has lost both eyes, who has lost two hands, who has lost two feet, to the man who has lost an arm and a leg, to the man who is helpless and permanently bedridden. He should be granted a pension—a word that comprehends not only his physical impairment for earning a living but also takes into consideration that he rendered valorous services; that he performed acts of heroism; that he has made a sacrifice for his country. His disfigurement also should be considered. But this rule of commercial compensation does not know anything about the principles to which I allude. They are foreign to the principle of commercial compensation which enters into and which is the rule for measuring the amount to be paid under the war-risk insurance law. Paragraph 2 of that act requires the bureau officials to make a schedule of ratings of reduction of earning capacity from specific injuries and combinations of injuries of a permanent nature.

These ratings can be as high as 100 per cent, but they are required to be based, "as far as practicable upon the average impairment of the earning capacity resulting from such injuries in civil occupations." The bureau officials construe this provision to mean that they must classify the soldiers in reference to their vocation or calling in civil life, that they must determine whether or not the soldier in one of these classes is entitled to a greater or less compensation than soldiers in another and dissimilar class who are likewise mutilated, and the result is that practically for the same injury a pension of \$25 or \$27 or \$28 a month is allowed to one man who has lost an arm or a part of an arm, and then for a soldier in another class only \$18 or \$20 is allowed. I think that this ought to be eliminated from the law. We give the private and the officer the same rate, or we intended to, in the way of compensation. I do not believe that there should be this discrimination in the law between classes of soldiers.

For instance, a soldier who is a lawyer will not be considered as having sustained as great a loss on account of an amputated arm or hand as a soldier who has followed the vocation of a carpenter.

In passing, I wish to state that it will be impossible to ever convince the soldier receiving the lesser rate of compensation that he is not entitled to the higher rate. The lawyer with an arm and a leg off and without clientele will certainly think he is entitled to as much as the carpenter likewise mutilated.

I happened to know at one time a one-armed carpenter who got along much better, so far as making a living is concerned, than many lawyers.

Under the war-risk law the soldier who loses two hands or two feet, or two eyes, or is helpless and permanently bedridden, receives \$100 per month, and under the ruling of the bureau officials he is entitled to the 240 monthly payments of any insurance he may have taken out—that is, they hold that these disabilities render him totally and permanently disabled within the meaning of the law. This I believe is the proper interpretation of the act, for I believe the above disabilities to be fair illustrations of what Congress considered to be of total and of permanent nature.

The soldier who loses an arm and a leg, or a hand and a foot, or an arm or a foot will receive anywhere from eighteen to thirty dollars per month for the injury, and out of this he will have to pay the monthly premiums on his insurance or allow the same to lapse unless he has some other income or means, while the soldier losing two hands or two feet will receive \$100 per month special compensation, and if he has taken out \$10,000 of insurance, he will receive in addition to his special compensation \$57.50 per month on his insurance for the period of 20 years.

The insurance to the man who has only one arm and one leg is a handicap to him, as it is a monthly expense and something from which he will never derive any direct benefit and which will never be of any personal assistance to him. We insisted that they should take out this insurance when they were drafted, and now we require them to let it lapse in the event they have no independent means or force them to pay the monthly premiums on their policies out of an inadequate monthly compensation, less than half the pension now paid to the Spanish-American War veteran likewise crippled.

These men can not be anyways near adequately compensated unless the law is amended by specifying the rates for specific injuries, as was done in the general pension law, or the basis for total disability on account of injuries resulting from amputations, or equivalent conditions, be raised from thirty to one hundred dollars per month in the war-risk law.

This is the rate provided in the law for the loss of two hands, or two feet, or two eyes, or for becoming totally blind or helpless and permanently bedridden; and if Congress will specifically declare the rate of \$100 per month as the basis for total disability resulting from amputations of limbs and parts thereof, and

equivalent conditions, and direct that the impairments of earning capacity resulting from such amputations or conditions be given a rate of compensation prorated on the basic \$100 for total disability, the bureau officials by applying the tables of rates and methods now employed would arrive at a rate of compensation for the specific injuries I refer to approximating those carried in the general pension law for similar disabilities.

The War Risk Bureau officials, after more than a year spent in administering the law, suggested or recommended some months ago, so I am informed, that the basis for total disability for what is known as amputated cases or equivalent conditions be raised from \$30 to \$100 per month, the specific rate in the law for the loss of both eyes, two feet, or both hands, and so forth.

This recommendation of the bureau officials is a high tribute to the Pension Committees of the House, for the foregoing \$100 rate per month is the result of an amendment offered by myself when the war-risk insurance bill was under consideration by the House, and I took the rate carried by the existing general pension law for the disabilities above enumerated. The bureau officials state that by applying their tables and methods of computation for partial disabilities from amputations and equivalent conditions that they will arrive at the same rate or about the same rates carried in the general pension law for the same or similar disabilities, a further tribute to the good judgment of the Pension Committees of the House and the Congresses which enacted the laws carrying some of the specific rates referred to more than 30 or 40 years ago.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House has been so busy investigating the packers and the multitudinous matters piling up before it that it has had no time to consider propositions or suggestions to remedy the imperfections of the war-risk insurance law, although glaring injustices are being daily worked out by the bureau in charge of its administration; and the fault is not with the bureau officials, but with the law.

In order to bring this matter more forcibly to the attention of the House, I have introduced a House resolution to create a new committee, to be known as the committee on soldiers' compensation and insurance, to which may be referred all matters and bills affecting soldiers' compensation and insurance. This committee can devote its whole time to matters coming before it, which will soon be voluminous.

The House has had a pension committee since 1813, and since 1880 it has had two committees to look after the pensions of soldiers of past wars. The enlisted and drafted men of this war, I presume, nearly equal in numbers the total number of the soldiers serving in all the other wars since the birth of the Nation. Therefore there should be a special committee to look after the compensation and insurance of the soldiers of this war. Many imperfections will be found in the existing law, and soon there will be thousands of bills for special relief introduced for those who can not obtain justice under the general law, and these matters should have the attention of a committee which can devote its whole time to the consideration of these subjects.

When the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House was created, no one ever dreamed that it would some time in the future consider and report out legislation for the insurance of ships and seamen and eventually stretch forth its tentacles and take jurisdiction of subjects and over matters which had been under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Pension Committee and the Pension Committees of the House since 1813. But, as this committee has now lost the services of the originator of the law and the colossal bureau builder of this administration, the late Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, I submit that there can be no further excuse offered for its retention of jurisdiction over matters pertaining to pensions or soldiers' insurance. The committee had more work than it could well do before it was commanded to take jurisdiction of pensions.

The 4,000,000 soldiers serving us in the war now closing, and their dependents, will furnish all the work necessary to keep one committee busy, and they should have the whole attention of one committee. The soldiers and ex-soldiers of the Civil War, and their dependents, have at their service the Invalid Pension Committee of the House. I therefore trust that the Republicans, in the organization of the next House, will give this matter their utmost careful attention, and I believe that they will come to the conclusion that such a committee as provided for in my House resolution No. 558 should be created. It may be found necessary to create a committee on allotments and allowances, but I do not believe that the allotment and allowance feature of the war-risk insurance law should be blended or mixed with the subjects that may be



placed under the jurisdiction of the committee on soldiers' compensation and insurance proposed in my House resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this morning we agreed to a conference report carrying \$600,000. This evening we will pass this bill carrying a few million dollars, to-morrow we will consider a bill perhaps to appropriate \$750,000,000 to the railroads, and the next day a bill appropriating a billion and a quarter of dollars to the farmers, so that what I have to say may seem very inconsequential. I hold in my hand a letter written from the Quartermaster Department to a man who was a first-class private in the aero squadron in France, and by the time he received the letter had received a probably merited promotion to first lieutenant. This letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL OF THE ARMY,  
TRANSPORTATION AND TELEGRAPH BRANCH,  
Washington, August 7, 1918.

No. 553.4-CD-T-Fessenden  
B. & A.-2174.

From: The Acting Quartermaster General of the Army.  
To: Pvt. (First Class) Frank W. Tillman, A. S. S. E. R. C., care Adjutant General of the Army, Washington, D. C.  
Subject: Transfer of baggage.

1. On August 25, 1917, you were issued transportation from Boston, Mass., to Fairfield, Ohio. In connection with this transportation you had your baggage transferred from the Big Four station to the Ohio electric station in Dayton, Ohio.

2. As this transfer was not authorized, it is requested that you forward a check for 25 cents promptly to this office.

By authority of the Acting Quartermaster General:  
T. F. POWELL,  
Major, Q. M. R. C.

Paid February 5, 1918, 25 cents. P. M.  
LGF/AC. RDR.

Inclosed find stamps to cover.

REMBERCOURT, FRANCE.

FRANK W. TILLMAN,  
First Lieutenant, A. S., U. S. A.,  
185th Aero Squadron, 2d Pursuit Group, A. E. F., France.

And the young man complied and forwarded 25 cents. Here was a young man in the Army granted transportation home, and when he reached the city of Dayton he easily and quickly left the Big Four Railroad and transferred to the Electric Ohio Road, which runs through the village of Fairfield, and a great and grateful Republic spends a few dollars in connection with the official communications to inform the young man that he ought to have carried his baggage in his hand instead of transferring it from the Big Four station to the Ohio Electric station, and demanding that he refund to this Government 25 cents. I have often read little descriptions, under the head of "the meanest man" of various kinds, endeavoring to illustrate how small some one person could be in reference to money. We must not forget that in the appropriation of these vast and enormous sums of money we have some very careful officials who insist on collecting, at the expense of several dollars, 25 cents from a poor soldier who did the sensible thing and had his baggage transferred, and then went back to the fighting line and risked his life in aeroplanes and received a promotion from a private to that of first lieutenant. I rather think that the Government takes the cake on being "the meanest man." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I have not taken up much time on the floor of this House, and I would not speak now, when time is so valuable, if I did not think that something ought to be said with reference to the tendency manifested here to criticize and try to embarrass the President. This tendency has been more marked since the ending of the war, although it had existed before. We all know what efforts were made by the other side of the House to take the control of the war out of the hands of the President, where the Constitution had placed it, and to put it in the hands of committees to be selected by Congress, a fact that was pointed out by the President in his letter, which has been so much misrepresented, the letter on which the opposition based its statement, and reiterated the same both on the platform and in the press, that the President had branded the Republicans as disloyal, when just the opposite was true, when he had said that they were prowar but anti-administration, which every man in this House knows was true, as applied to the great majority. Some of us remember that when a month or so before the election the gentleman from East St. Louis, Ill., made his bitter and rhetorical attack upon the

President it was greeted by loud applause on the Republican side, as were other attacks.

Nevertheless, the Republicans went before the people contending that they were better friends of the President and had supported him better than the Democrats. But no sooner had they gotten in on this theory than they studiously began to try to embarrass him in every way possible.

On the very first day of this session of Congress, when the President appeared to deliver his message, they sought to insult and humiliate him by studied discourtesy, and the same spirit has manifested itself continuously to this day. Everything that he has done has been wrong. He has been on a mission as noble and commendable as ever engaged the attention of any statesman, trying—honestly trying—to bring about such a settlement of this war as will make impossible the recurrence of such another world catastrophe. Certainly this is a desirable end. He may fall far short of his aims. The world has been thousands of years in the making, and its trend can not be entirely changed in a few short months. But much can be done to bring about changes which the lessons of this great war have brought the people to realize the need of. And we should certainly commend the President for the great work he is trying to do instead of criticizing him and throwing obstructions in his way, making his work more difficult. Instead of trying to help and encourage the President in this great work, many Members of Congress seem to want to make his work as difficult as possible, and are trying to discount the result in advance.

A league of nations will not bring about the millenium, but it can do much to lessen the danger of future wars by substituting reason for force in the settlement of international controversies. We settle our domestic difficulties in that way, and there is no reason why we should not settle our international difficulties in the same way. There is no more reason why international difficulties should be settled by force than there is for the settlement of our personal difficulties in the same way.

Some criticism has been made because the peace conference has not concluded its work sooner. Better take a little more time and do this work well; too much haste is always regrettable. Let us tie the nations up in a league that will be permanent while the necessity for the same is impressed on the minds of the people by the great catastrophe which has befallen them. It has been said that the conference should complete its work and bring our boys home as soon as possible. We are all anxious to have our boys brought home, but this will not be hastened by a speedy conclusion of peace. Every ship that comes over now is loaded to its full capacity. It took more than a year to transport 2,000,000 troops, the largest Army we ever had, 3,000 miles across the ocean with the aid of our allies, which was considered almost a miracle, and it will take longer to bring them back.

It has been said on the floor of this House that we should get out of Europe as soon as possible and go back to the good old days of Washington and Jefferson, when we had no entangling alliances but were sufficient unto ourselves. President Wilson should come home, it has been said, and leave Europe to settle its own difficulties and make its own peace. Happy would we be if this could be done. We tried to keep out of the war and to keep free from these entanglements, and we kept out as long as possible, and many of you then criticized the President for keeping us out too long; some of you who are now criticizing him because he does not get out soon enough. You would have him return home and let the warring parties establish another balance of power which might become unbalanced at any time and fall, as it did in the past, with disastrous results to the people of the world. The loss of more than 50,000 of the best of our American boys and a debt of \$50,000,000,000, which probably we will eventually have as the result of this war, testify to the futility of any attempt on our part to adopt a policy of nonintervention in world politics. We could not keep out of this world conflagration, and what assurance have we that we could keep out of the next one? Modern science has brought the peoples of the world so closely together that a great upheaval in one part of the world is felt by all civilized people everywhere.

The fathers and mothers of the boys who have made such great sacrifices in this war, and the taxpayers, who will have to bear the financial burden, are back of our great President, wishing him every success. If he can even in a small degree lessen the danger of the occurrence of wars by a league of nations, the people are for it. And instead of decrying our great President and trying to belittle his efforts, we should help him and be proud of him, and of the great work he is doing. No



man at the peace conference has more influence than he; and he would have a still greater influence if he had behind him at home a sympathetic and united Congress.

No man before ever had such a world-wide influence as has Woodrow Wilson. His name is known in every civilized country on the globe, and wherever people are struggling for liberty and the right of self-government their eyes are turned to him, and in him they find their champion. He is the idol of the great mass of the common people the world over; he is revered and looked up to among the people of the nations allied with us, and also by the people striving for democracy, even in the countries with which we have been at war.

What gives him this world power? The same thing that gave him his power at home. The American people have been behind him and Congress has followed his lead, because it was realized that when he spoke it was the voice of the people. How frequently have we seen the defeat in this House of measures advocated by him when they were being considered in the "Committee of the Whole," where there could be no record vote, and then seen these same measures pass this House when there was a roll call, and with the aid of the votes of the same men who had voted against them in committee? Men on both sides of the House have voted for these measures against their personal inclination only because they knew that the people were back of the President. It is this same thing that gives him his power at the world conference. The great mass of the war-weary people of the world are behind him. They have seen in him the embodiment of the principles for which they are striving, and they have made him their spokesman. When he speaks at the world conference it is realized that the people of the world are speaking, and politicians and statesmen of all countries listen.

Can we not forget politics for the time being? Important as it was that we should win the war, the work ahead of us now is no less important; nothing is of more importance than that the questions growing out of this war shall be settled right, so that all our sacrifices shall not have been in vain.

For one, I have no patience with all this talk that, having turned the tide at the critical moment and thus helped to win this war, we have no further duty in the matter, but should come home as fast as we can and leave the settlement to our allies. Experience having shown our vital interest in the questions involved in this war, we have a right to insist, and we would be false to our trust if we did not do so, that these questions must be so settled that we will not again be caught in a great world whirlpool. The American people, who have made the sacrifices necessary to win this war, expect and demand nothing less. If we disappoint them by opposition and obstruction where we should render assistance, we will rue it; we will be faithless to our trust and little less than disloyal to our country. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no patience with any criticism that smacks of politics, but there are times when because of politics to refrain from justly criticizing becomes a breach of duty. I am hoping through the publicity of the following facts to get from the War Department some late, authentic, definite information concerning the present condition of the Thirty-sixth Division in France and, if possible, to secure for the soldiers—brave fighting boys from Texas and Oklahoma—better camp conditions and more comfortable quarters during their enforced stay in a foreign land.

On February 7 Mr. R. E. Johnson, whose home is in Burnet, Tex., and who is a veteran officer of the Spanish-American War, came into my office, stating he had just arrived from France, and that on leaving the Thirty-sixth Division about 20 days before he had promised some Texas boys from my district to let me know the numerous hardships they were undergoing, urging me to get for them some relief.

I immediately sent the following letter to the Secretary of War:

FEBRUARY 7, 1919.

HON. NEWTON D. BAKER,  
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A substantial citizen from my district has just returned from France. He tells me that he left Brest January 25, and left the Thirty-sixth Division about 20 days ago.

He informed me that the Thirty-sixth Division was quartered in an area of about 10 miles square, and that while the officers had beds to sleep in in the farmhouses the privates were occupying barns, outhouses, chicken houses, and every other place that afforded any cover, with mud everywhere and much sickness. He also stated that these men generally were scratching themselves sore because of "cooties" and were disheartened, with no hope of getting home soon.

Instead of making public criticism in the House, and probably do an injustice to your department, I am bringing this complaint direct to you, hoping that you will give me the facts as they really exist and will take immediate steps to remedy this condition. My informant

is a credible citizen, loyal to the core, and would not have made this complaint had there been no foundation for it.

In this connection, if it is possible, could you give me some intimation when the Thirty-sixth may be expected home?

Very sincerely, yours,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

Five days elapsed, and I received under date of February 11 the following communication from the Secretary of War:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, February 11, 1919.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: I deeply appreciate the information contained in your letter of February 7 and the spirit in which you transmit it. On the occasion of my own visits to France I confess I was amazed at the conditions under which the soldiers had to live; but, of course, there are some two million British soldiers and about two million American soldiers there for whom no permanent provision could be made, and who then had to live, and probably still have to live, under conditions which in this country would be regarded as quite impossible. The contrast between our well-ordered camps in this country, with their barracks, storehouses, bathing facilities, etc., and a quartered division in France is something which can not be described but must be seen to be understood.

Of course, the signing of the armistice enabled us to move some divisions from the least possible places, but until a substantial number of our troops are returned it will not be possible to find even moderately comfortable surroundings for them. We are, of course, using every ship we can lay our hands upon to carry soldiers home, and each boatload diminishes the problem on the other side, but the problem is still there, and is serious, and part of its seriousness lies in the fact that, of course, every soldier now in France has his mind set on coming home, the inspiration under which they lived while the war was still on is withdrawn, and they are more sensitive to unpleasant conditions. In addition to that, I know of no country in the world where it rains so steadily and so often, or where the mud is so impressive, as it is in France at this season of the year. Fortunately, the health records of the Army in France do not bear out the apprehension of your friend as to the sickness prevailing there. It seems to be true that mud is less dangerous than the dust which they have to endure in the summer.

However, I am never willing to rest on presumptions about matters of this kind, and will have an immediate inquiry made into the situation of the Thirty-sixth Division, so as to be sure that everything possible is being done for its comfort. I shall be glad, also, to let you know as early as I can the probable date of the return of the division.

Cordially, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,  
Secretary of War.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,  
House of Representatives.

I have received a letter from a major in the United States Army, in which he takes exception to the statement of Mr. Johnson, and from which I quote the following excerpts:

Up to December 5, when I left my battalion, I had only had one death among 480 men and 20 officers.

I, as an officer of this division, wish to forcibly protest and request that Mr. Johnson's statement be withdrawn.

The officers slept in beds in private houses, and the men were billeted in houses, barns, old storerooms, wooden barracks, etc., and were not in camp in the mud as reported.

In regard to the body lice, when men fight in the rain and mud, take their rest in shell holes half filled with water, and otherwise live the life of beasts, which is a necessity in the style of fighting the Thirty-sixth went through, it is to be expected that they will accumulate a few body lice, known in the trenches as "cooties," but better known among the Americans as "crums." But the Medical Department must be credited with a continual war against these festive birds from the time the men are inducted in the service until their discharge. Where and when possible a portable bath is set up and the men given a chance to scrub them off and put on clean clothing and given a fair chance to rid themselves. As soon as the division was moved to winter quarters permanent baths were established, and the men were checked off as they bathed. In view of the fact that at no time could it be possible for every man in an organization to be put through at the same time, and the lice hiding out at bathing time, there is bound to be a few escape. This can not be avoided, and it delays the extermination necessarily for several weeks. I have no doubt but what the Thirty-sixth is entirely rid of them by now.

Notwithstanding the demand of this major in the Army that Mr. Johnson retract, I have a written statement from Mr. Johnson making no retraction. This major left France on December 5, while Mr. Johnson sailed from Brest on January 25.

The following is Mr. Johnson's statement, made since he was criticized by this major in the United States Army:

Inasmuch as it has been published that I had made complaint about the billeting of the Thirty-sixth (Texas-Oklahoma Volunteer) Division in France, I take the liberty to submit a statement that I believe the men of the Thirty-sixth, when they finally return home and are free to express themselves, will declare to be conservative.

I met Congressman BLANTON in his office in Washington a few days ago and related to him what I saw and experienced of the situation of the Thirty-sixth Division as it was when I left it, about one month since, and it is evident that immediate representations were made to the War Department by Mr. BLANTON looking to a betterment of the conditions existing, and now, in order that all who wish to do so may cooperate in such reasonable, patriotic way as they may choose, I submit my observations and offer my own personal suggestions in the premises.

The States of Texas and Oklahoma have two divisions accredited to them jointly overseas, viz, the Ninetieth, commonly known as the National Army Division, and the Thirty-sixth, commonly known as the Volunteer or National Guard Division. The latter, however, is largely mixed, having many selected (drafted) men in its ranks.

The Ninetieth Division was soon after the signing of the armistice designated as a part of the army of occupation and has been in the army of occupation at or near the extreme front for some time, and, from reports received by me from men coming back from that area and from newspaper reports, it seems that the Ninetieth is well billeted, comfortable, and enjoying cleanly, sanitary, and good moral environment,



The Thirty-sixth Division, after the signing of the armistice, was marched back toward the interior of France to a point some 125 miles from Paris, the men believing that they were on their way to a port of embarkation and home. They were billeted in a rural district over an area of some 15 miles square, usually a small contingent in each small farm village. In France I saw no farmhouses as we understand the term. The farms range from less than an acre to several acres, and the people who do the farming live in the near-by villages. There being so very little suitable ground for camps of tents or barracks, the Army has adopted the only sensible plan for troops to occupy the country by billeting them in these villages, and, naturally, the soldiers' requirements are just that much in excess of the purposes for which the villages were established, creating the necessity for occupying as sleeping quarters for the soldiers almost every kind of building that will shield the soldier from the rain that scarcely ever ceases to fall; consequently, the men of the Thirty-sixth Division are occupying all sorts of domiciles, some comparatively good, some better than none, and including barns and other outhouses, with, in many cases, huge piles of manure in very close proximity to these living and sleeping quarters of the men and to their source of drinking water; the latter, however, regulations forbid the men to drink until it has been placed in large water bags and chemically treated.

In some instances horses, cows, rabbits, and fowls occupy the same building as the men, with partitions separating, which do not in all cases prevent the odors from the animals reaching the quarters of the men.

While the military authorities have endeavored to clean up the men moved back from the trenches to the interior, it is quite evident that the men of the Thirty-sixth Division have not been rid of the body lice, a most disgusting, humiliating, and demoralizing pest to the men who are forced to endure such inhabitants of their bodies.

Fuel for the men to use in their billets has at times been hard to get, and I am reliably informed that some of the men bought wood at about the equivalent of \$18 per cord when they had not received wood or fuel from the Army supply.

Without any purpose to create the impression that the womanhood of France is totally depraved, I certainly feel justified in saying that immorality is so openly in evidence that I believe a truthful statement, which may be had from our soldiers when they return, will seem to the average American gross exaggeration.

As to intoxicating drinks, while I do not expect our soldiers to come any nearer "going to the devil" as the victims of booze than have the American people thus far, nevertheless France seems to be overflowing with that means of debauchery, and we certainly are not ready to treat our brave men in France as we would convicts and deprive them of liberty to the extent that would insure even a temperate use of intoxicants by those who have the inclination to imbibe freely.

The men of the Thirty-sixth Division have that same true American spirit that has sustained our country since its beginning. They gave themselves to battle for the ideals which prompted us to go to war, and they have endured uncomplainingly every hardship and unpleasant circumstance incident to their purpose to whip Germany and finish the job quickly. They appreciated every effort, and cooperated therein, of the people and the Government to get them overseas and into the fight; but, after all, they are not soldiers; they don't want to be soldiers, and they should not be looked upon any longer as mere soldiers. They are, and should be considered by us, an overseas portion of the best of our citizenry; men really more deeply interested in the affairs of our Nation than those on this side who have not gone through the crucible of the last year "over there." They are thinking, virile, earnest young men, who have offered their all and given much, and who now yearn to be granted their citizenship again at the hands of their Government that they may return to their homes and loved ones and resume their civilian life and participate with those at home in shaping the destiny of the United States, to them the greatest country on all the globe. They believe that they have earned that reasonable consideration from the folks at home that would demand and accomplish their severance from the Army with the very least possible delay consistent with the real needs of our Nation at this time. Knowing that the large majority of them are farmers and stock raisers, and that others of them need have no apprehension as to securing employment after being discharged, they are interested in becoming producers instead of very expensive consumers in a far-distant land, and they think along these lines largely because they realize that upon the soldiers now in service and others of their generation will fall much of the burden of meeting the expenses of this war.

Considering the matter from the standpoint of a citizen of the United States just returned from France and familiar with the Thirty-sixth Division as at present located, it would not be unreasonable, nor would it be unpatriotic, on the part of the people of Texas and Oklahoma to urge the return home and demobilization of one of the divisions—either the Thirty-sixth or Ninetieth—at the very earliest possible time commensurate with the actual military needs of the United States, and it certainly would be gratifying to be able to meet part of the farming difficulties of these two far Southern States, where plowing is now in progress for this year's crop, with the men from one of those divisions. As to which division the department might choose to send home, if either can now be spared, to one familiar with the location of each division it would seem reasonable to suppose that the Thirty-sixth would be chosen as the first to return to the States. It is several hundred miles nearer the port of embarkation; it would have to be moved several hundred miles from its present location over into Germany should it be substituted to occupy the sector now held by the Ninetieth; it would have to be "cleaned up" and reequipped; and then, finally, when the peace pact is signed, the Thirty-sixth, if substituted for the Ninetieth at the extreme front, would probably be brought back over the route it would take going up, entailing over 400 miles double travel on the Thirty-sixth, while the time required to make such a change or substitution would probably run into months and accomplished at what might be a useless expense, when it is considered that there can hardly be any preference on the part of the people at home as to which of said divisions is released from military duty first.

In conclusion I wish to state and emphasize the statement, that I have been on the ground and given very careful thought as to what is right and proper for the people at home to do, or suggest being done, for the Texas-Oklahoma men constituting the two divisions in the American Expeditionary Forces and my own humble opinion is that the War Department has done all that has been reasonably possible to be done for the welfare of these troops. I believe that the department is worthy of commendation for having no worse conditions than now prevail with the 36th Division and I firmly believe that it would really be a mistake and waste of money and time to attempt to better existing conditions with that division so long as it is necessary for it to remain in France.

Climatic conditions do not give way to man's desires, therefore, rain and mud must be contended with and men on duty must be exposed to it and as long as the division exists the duties of the soldier must be performed, rain or shine. It is a wonder to me that fuel has been attainable and distributed as well as it has to the 36th, under existing circumstances.

The lice that torment and humiliate the men were acquired at the front, whence they were known to exist, even before the United States declared war, in uncountable billions, beyond the power of man to destroy and the millions of soldiers who have come back through France must have left these pests in most every billet in the interior of France that will perhaps require years of peace-time effort and equipment to eliminate.

Practically every acre of France is devoted to intensive farming, except just room enough for roads, canals, timber areas, villages and cities, so that, in the interior especially, it is not practicable to erect tents or barracks for Army camps; such camps would become quagmires and seas of mud even before completed, so that the billet even in barns and like buildings along or near macadamized roads or streets is far more preferable than tents or barracks in fields that become mud ponds.

The laws, customs, and habits of France are as firmly fixed upon the French people as are our laws, customs, and habits fixed upon us, and, while the French have certain wholesome regulations that have for their object the protection of the soldier from vice and intoxication, for the United States to undertake to remodel French laws, customs, and habits to even approximate those of Texas and Oklahoma would seem as ridiculous to the French people and government as would a proposal of France to have Texas and Oklahoma adopt French laws, customs, and habits.

It certainly does the heart of an American good to find, as I did, that every American soldier he meets abroad is more in love with "the dear old U. S. A." than ever before. I found no boasting among those who had been "in the thick of it"; in fact, was forced to patiently wait and listen to conversations between men who had been over the top, and among men who had dared as terrible dangers in getting supplies and munitions up to the trenches, to gain information as to what our men really did, and there I heard what would be termed, ordinarily, hair-raising experiences spoken of and somewhat detailed in a manner that impressed me that none of them felt that it was a matter to be exaggerated or treated in any other way than as a serious duty performed to the best of the ability of the participant, at a great cost of comrades, who "paid the last full measure of their devotion," and then to see these great, strong young fellows when the conversation would, as it always did, revert to home, to see them search for some little memento or photograph that would take their thoughts and hearts back across the ocean, and to know that, while none of them ever entertained a thought of shirking any duty due the homeland, how very earnestly, indeed, each one longed for the day when he could set his face toward the West under orders to return to the dearest place on earth, resolved me to lay their case before their home people and to say to their home people, "Be sure that those boys shall know that you exerted every honorable, patriotic effort to have them returned home just as soon as it was possible to spare them from overseas, and that a real welcome awaits them when they arrive."

I further suggest that every honorable effort be made immediately to see that Congress enacts the necessary legislation for a new Army to take the place of the men now overseas, and such a bill having been reported and well on its way, Congressmen and Senators should be induced to hasten its passage to the very utmost and to eliminate useless debate and red-tape procedure; in other words, let's show fully as much real zeal in getting our citizens home as we did in getting them overseas, and we shall have the everlasting praise of those citizens.

Respectfully,

R. E. JOHNSON.

On February 14, not having received any satisfactory reply from the War Department, I sent to the Secretary of War the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 14, 1919.

Hon. NEWTON D. BAKER,

Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.:

Since writing yours 11th will you kindly advise whether you have yet received the definite information concerning the Thirty-sixth Division requested in my letter 7th?

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

I have received from the Assistant Chief of Staff the following letter dated February 14, but which, as shown by the envelope, was not mailed by his department until February 17, four days later, wherein he attempts to answer in general terms the statement from Mr. Johnson, but he does not show that any information whatever has been received from France since my letter of February 7.

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,  
Washington, February 14, 1919.

The Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C.,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The Secretary of War directs that I acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 7, relative to the Thirty-sixth Division, and to inform you as follows:

The Thirty-sixth Division is located in one of the areas assigned by the French authorities for the occupancy of our troops. Each division is assigned an area of sufficient billeting capacity to accommodate it. The troops are housed in buildings or billets according to the universal European custom, and not in tents. According to the French custom, all the buildings which are fit for sheltering troops in each area have been noted on them by the French authorities the number of officers, men, or animals that they are expected to accommodate. Officers very frequently are allotted beds, and in many cases the noncommissioned officers and privates. Frequently the accommodations in the areas are so limited that officers use their own camp cots, while at one town accommodations were sufficiently ample to assign rooms and beds in a hotel at a fashionable watering place to the privates.

It is true that the billeting accommodations in the area now occupied by the Thirty-sixth Division are not as extensive as those in some other areas, and it is true that an application to the French to add a fairly large town to this area was disapproved by them for reasons which appeared correct. There are many reasons connected with French internal administration which fix the limits of the billeting



areas and their character depends entirely on the section of the country in which they are located. It has not been the practice for divisions to continually remain in one area, and no injustice or unnecessary hardship is inflicted on any division.

The mud can not be denied. It is everywhere. A mild winter, with incessant rain and dampness, has made the ground soft. The villages have no sidewalks and even on the hard, paved roads a slime of thin mud remains throughout the winter. Steps were taken at the headquarters of the corps to which the Thirty-sixth Division belongs to procure "duck boards" to lay on the ground in the muddiest places, by sending trucks to the depots of supply, and even far forward to the abandoned trenches, but no amount of "duck boards" can adequately combat the mud nuisance.

Such sickness as exists is chiefly attributable to the continued dampness and lack of sunshine. It is true that barns and outhouses are used, from necessity, as billets. The report that men are required to sleep in chicken houses conveys an exaggerated impression. Life in French villages is very primitive; steaming manure piles are in the streets and at the front doors of the houses, which are overrun with chickens, that have access to many buildings. Some buildings might appear to be chicken houses that actually are not.

In the matter of "cooties" every effort is made by encouraging bathing and the use of delousing machines to keep the men free from such vermin, which, of course, exist, though not to such an extent in the areas as at the front.

In regard to the men's getting home, it has been the fixed policy of the War Department to refrain from interfering with Gen. Pershing, who is given a free hand in designating the troops to return. This action is necessary because of the many problems still confronting him overseas, and were the War Department to embarrass him in the solution of these problems the result might be detrimental to the welfare of the country at large. Gen. Pershing has not yet designated the Thirty-sixth Division for return.

I trust that in my desire to furnish you a full and frank description of things as they exist I have not trespassed too much upon your time. It would be most desirable if the people of this country could realize the difficulties connected with bringing all the men home at once and, by counseling patience on the part of their loved ones, render the Nation a distinct service.

Sincerely, yours,

HENRY JERVEY,  
Major General, United States Army,  
Assistant Chief of Staff, Director of Operations.

I want to state that it does occur to me that when complaint is made by a Member of Congress to the War Department with respect to the conditions which surround a whole division of American soldiers in France, that complaint made on February 7 and this is February 19, that the War Department in that length of time could furnish some definite information concerning the condition of that camp. And I am making this criticism in the hope that the department will take some definite and immediate steps to see that these boys are given every care and every attention, and that the place will be surrounded by every comfort which the War Department is able to give to them.

I take it that these men hold us responsible in a way. We placed them there, and they are looking to us to see that they get proper treatment. No private over there is allowed to complain. We have learned by this time that if a private makes a complaint he is court-martialed. I am in favor of this Congress taking some steps to see that a private soldier in the Army can make a proper complaint to his Congressman, and that his Representative can go to the War Department and place the facts of that particular case before the War Department, and obtain justice for his constituent, without having that particular soldier drawn up and court-martialed and punished for it. If he can not look to his Representative, to whom can he look? His Representative is the only person on God's green earth to whom he can look for redress of any wrong, and I hope the War Department will take some action with respect to this Thirty-sixth Division. It is composed largely of Texas and Oklahoma volunteers, who have gone there willingly. As long as the war lasted they were willing to stand knee-deep in the mud, and fight in cootie-infested trenches, and bear all the hardships incident to cruel warfare; but now that the fighting is over, I do not think they should be billeted within 125 miles of Paris under the conditions acknowledged to exist in this camp.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That expenditures for carrying out the provisions of this act shall not be made in such manner as to prevent the operation of the Government arsenals at their most economical rate of production, except when a special exigency requires the operation of a portion of an arsenal's equipment at a different rate: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work.

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LUNN: Page 10, line 19, after the word "work" strike out the period and insert the following: "nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant."

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up the time of the committee. This amendment is intended simply to make this act conform with the language adopted in the Army bill and recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs. If there is opposition, I want to speak upon the amendment at more length. I do not think there will be opposition.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I will simply state that this section of the bill as reported is exactly in the language carried in the fortifications act for the current year. The amendment of the gentleman from New York was not called to the attention of the subcommittee or to the attention of the full committee. There was no objection to the language as carried in the current law when the bill was passed at the preceding session of Congress.

Personally, I have no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, but that is a matter to be left for the judgment of the House.

Mr. LUNN. A year ago, when the bill was introduced, the fortifications bill, it was a large bill, and I think it was passed in an hour's time. I understand this subject, and only half of it was covered in the bill of last year. I understand that the House wants to continue the same policy that they have followed for the last few years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. LUNN. A division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 7, yeas 14.

Mr. LUNN. I make the point of no quorum, Mr. Chairman. This is an important matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. LUNN. If there is any other way in which I can bring this to a vote of the House under the circumstances, I would take it, but there is no other way that I know of.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman can move to recommit the bill.

Mr. LUNN. I am not opposed to the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If any gentleman is opposed to it and says so, he has the preference; but if nobody qualifies to that extent, then the gentleman would have as much right to offer the motion to recommit as anybody else.

Mr. LUNN. I do not desire to consume the time of the committee or to make the point of no quorum, if there is any legislative way to have us continue as we have continued for years in this matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the gentleman will not make the point of no quorum, I will recognize him when we get back into the House, to make a motion to recommit, unless somebody qualifies up and down. [Applause.]

Mr. LUNN. I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 3, line 19, for the purpose of offering an amendment. I asked the chairman of the subcommittee about what time the general debate would close, and he said about half past 6. I got in here at a quarter after 6 and they had passed this section. I make that statement for the benefit of the committee. I have an amendment that I desire to offer. I trust the chairman of the committee will not object.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I take it, the gentleman does not mean to make the point of no quorum?

Mr. OVERSTREET. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to return to line 19, page 3, for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman offers his amendment, how much time does he propose to take on it?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Five or six minutes.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman take the vote in the committee here now?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OVERSTREET: Page 3, line 18, after the figures "\$544,000," insert: "For protection of the shores of Fort Screven, Ga., \$160,000."

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to authorize the expenditure of the sum of \$160,000 for protection of the shore of Fort Screven, Ga. The Chief of Staff of the Army has been informed that the Government reservation at this point was liable to great damage owing to the rapid encroachment of the sea, and ordered a survey and report to be submitted showing the true status of the matter. The local engineer recommended the expenditure of \$160,000 for the purpose of protecting the shore against the washing of the waves, and further recommended that this sum be expended in the construction of jetties to be built in accordance with recommendations made in the report. At the hearing before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations Gen. Winslow, of the Board of Engineers, when asked if he considered this an important piece of work, replied that personally he had no opinion on the subject, as he had not seen it, but said that he simply knew the report showed the situation is considered very serious. Upon this statement alone of Gen. Winslow the committee struck this item out of the original draft of the bill. I desire it reinstated.

I respectfully submit, gentlemen of the House, that the item of \$544,000 carried in this bill for the protection of the reservation at Sandy Hook is a parallel case with this, and if one is allowed the other should be allowed also. Gen. Winslow said he was not familiar with the Fort Screven project and could not recommend it for that reason. If it was necessary for Gen. Winslow to inspect the situation at Fort Screven in order for him to pass upon this question intelligently, then I submit it was his duty to visit Fort Screven and see for himself. As I have already stated, the local engineer's report shows something ought to be done to keep the shore from washing away, and therefore a prima facie case was made out in favor of the appropriation asked for in my amendment, and it was up to Gen. Winslow to negative this showing by a positive statement.

I have in my hand a memorandum furnished me by the Chief of Coast Artillery, and it shows that the value of the buildings alone at Fort Screven is \$801,895, besides the land, armament, and other equipment, and it does seem to me, in view of all these facts, that the committee should adopt the amendment. In addition to this, I have recently received from the former mayor of Tybee a letter, in which he says the situation there is very serious, and unless something is done a large number of houses will soon be washed into the sea. He says a number of buildings have already been moved back, in some instances 50 and in some 100 yards to prevent their being washed away.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I happen to know something about Tybee Island and that encroachment. It seems to have been caused by the digging of a new channel on the south. It has changed the whole current there so that they do not know how to control it at all. I do not know whether jetties will take care of it.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Several years ago some jetties were constructed at Fort Screven or out some distance from the shore line. These jetties were built of rock of various sizes. Some of the stone used in the jetties proved to be too small to remain in place under the action of the sea. One of these jetties in particular, so the report shows, proved practically adequate for the purpose, and is now intact. And the local engineer recommends that new jetties be built of stone of no less size than the material used in the successful jetty referred to.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I understand that the new channel has caused such a change in the currents that they do not know how to control them.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I am not an engineer, and, of course, I do not know how best to control the situation the gentleman from New Jersey speaks of, but I desire the amendment adopted and I would suggest that the Government engineers will know best how to use the appropriation provided for in the amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the gentleman so far as the situation at Fort Screven is concerned, but the committee felt that it had not sufficient information on it to submit a recommendation to the House. Gen. Winslow said positively he had no knowledge of the matter and he only relied upon the report furnished him; that he personally knew nothing whatever about it. Under the cir-

cumstances the committee felt it could not recommend to the House the appropriation of \$160,000 at Fort Screven.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I wish to say in reply to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee and the chairman of the subcommittee, that the report shows only two questions were asked Gen. Winslow. He said personally he did not know because he had not visited Fort Screven, and when asked if it needed protection he said the report shows the condition was very serious.

I sincerely hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is to put in an item of \$160,000 for the repair of this sea wall at Fort Screven. The only person that appeared before the subcommittee was Gen. Winslow, and he said he knew absolutely nothing about it. He brought certain photographs to show us the condition and a report made by an officer detailed there, and the officer says in this report:

I very recently made a visit and noticed the effect of the high tide while there was a strong east wind and considerable sea.

And then he says:

The photographs show a worse condition than that which actually existed.

Which convinced the committee that conditions were improving instead of getting worse; that the tide was bringing in the sand and doing just the very thing that the appropriation of this money would do, and that was to protect the island. There is no use in throwing away \$160,000. The item was not urged very strongly by the War Department itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. OVERSTREET) there were 8 ayes and 18 noes.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Tellers are demanded.

Four Members rose, not a sufficient number, and tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to section 4 and allow me to place in the stop-watch provision the language I have heretofore offered, and which was adopted by the Military Affairs Committee. If the chairman objects, I do not want to force a roll call.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. I object.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CLARK of Florida, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15979, the fortifications appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill be passed.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. OVERSTREET, by unanimous consent, was given leave to extend his remarks in the Record.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 20, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation, required by the National Bank Redemption Agency of the Office of the Treasurer of the United States, for additional force for the last four



months of the current fiscal year and for the fiscal year 1920, the same to be reimbursed by the banks (H. Doc. No. 1818); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting an estimate of appropriation to pay a claim for damages by collision, river and harbor work, which has been adjusted and settled by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army (H. Doc. No. 1819); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting an item of repeal of certain appropriations for housing war needs, together with an authorization in connection therewith, for incorporation in the sundry civil act (H. Doc. No. 1820); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BURNETT, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16017) to expel and exclude from the United States certain undesirable aliens, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1093), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SUMNERS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15675) to fix the time of holding court in the Amarillo division of the northern district of Texas, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1113), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12607) for the relief of Freddie Scofield, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1094), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12608) for the relief of Mrs. A. R. Carstens, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1095), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12609) for the relief of T. Binford, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1096), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12610) for the relief of W. H. Burkett, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1097), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12611) for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Wright, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1098), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12614) for the relief of Mrs. E. A. Thompson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1099), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12615) for the relief of Miss Almer Reichart, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1100), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12616) for the relief of Charles T. Clayton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1101), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12617) for the relief of Mrs. E. M. Jones, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No.

1102), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12619) for the relief of James Edward Lyon, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1103), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12620) for the relief of G. W. Butcher, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1104), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12621) for the relief of W. A. Wise, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1105), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12622) for the relief of Mary E. Winkler, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1106), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12623) for the relief of Mrs. D. R. Patton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1107), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12624) for the relief of Mrs. S. Satton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1108), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12625) for the relief of Mrs. Horace Moody, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1109), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12606) for the relief of William J. Drucks, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1110), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12612) for the relief of Mrs. E. J. Meineke, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1111), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12618) for the relief of Mrs. F. H. Sherbert, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1112), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolution, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 16035) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Garden City, in the county of Finney and State of Kansas, two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 16036) to amend section 2, title 12, of an act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 16037) to amend section 277 (a) of the revenue act of 1918 and extending the date for completing returns under said act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 16038) to repeal the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 16039) to repeal the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 16040) to provide a commission to secure plans and design for an arch to be erected in the city of Chicago, Ill., known as "a national arch of triumph," to commemorate freedom to the world and the heroes and events of the great war; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 16041) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the district of Lawrence, in the State of



New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 16042) to authorize the Commissioner of Navigation to change the names of vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 16043) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 16047) to donate one captured cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Tippecanoe, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) urging that the claims of the people of South Africa be heard at the peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution (H. Res. 594) for the consideration of H. J. Res. 357; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 595) for the consideration of S. 2654; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, protesting against the canalization of the St. Lawrence River between Montreal and Lake Ontario; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Miss RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 16044) for the relief of Henry Buck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16045) for the relief of Amos Buck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16046) granting a pension to Theresa Arnold; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Petition of the Retail Merchants' Association, Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the luxury tax and asking that it be removed from the revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of the State of Ohio, urging the enactment of bill similar or identical with House bill 10550, providing for national ownership and Government operation of all railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of the adjutant general of the State of New York, relating to Senate bill 5500, amending the National Guard defense act of June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Ezra Betzar Society, of city of Milwaukee, Wis., urging against passage of Burnett bill (H. R. 13669), excluding immigration into United States for period of four years; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of annual convention of Will County, Ill., Farmers' Institute, asking that the President and Congress recognize the newly proclaimed government of Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of citizens of Pomfret, North Pomfret, Woodstock, South Royalton, and South Pomfret, Vt., favoring the repeal of the postal zone system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DILL: Petition of J. W. Allen and other residents of Spokane and Hillyard, Wash., urging national ownership and Government operation of all railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of Rotary Club of New York, requesting passage of bill to establish a national conservatory of music in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of United States soldiers of Lithuanian origin, in favor of freedom for Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of George S. Gardner, 3734 West Thirty-third Street, Cleveland, Ohio, and 45 other citizens, in favor of the repeal of the postal zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Petition of Central Trades and Labor Council of Olean, N. Y., favoring the retention of the railroads by the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Dunkirk, N. Y., favoring the retention of the railroads by the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, against persons who had declared intention of becoming citizens of United States and who left this country for the purpose of entering armies of enemy, that they should be forever debarred from reentry to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of Williamsport Board of Trade, of Williamsport, Pa., with reference to Government control of telephone and telegraph systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Sub-Lodge No. 545, International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron-Ship Builders, and Helpers of America, of Renovo, Pa., favoring Government ownership and operation of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Wellsboro Chamber of Commerce, of Wellsboro, Pa., with reference to the Federal control of telephone and telegraph systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of members of the Prospect Methodist Episcopal Church, at Bristol, Conn., indorsing league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, urging the discontinuance of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, urging an immediate appropriation by Congress for the purchase and improvement of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of Chamber of Commerce, Doylestown, Pa., favoring a reasonable period to allow for the necessary preparation and adjustment by the owners of the great wire systems under Federal control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 20, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we call upon Thy name because we are seekers after the truth. We are not afraid of the truth. With all our splendid traditions and all our inheritance of faith and character, with a passion that God has given to us out of the past for the things that are highest, we are not afraid to face the truth. We pray that that equipment for service that comes from the God of Truth may be given to each one of us that we may perform our duties as in the sight of God and receive Thy blessing upon a service well done. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. VARDAMAN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Caldwell	Kirby	Pollock	Thomas
Culbertson	La Follette	Ransdell	Thompson
Curtis	Lenrott	Saulsbury	Trammell
Fernald	McCumber	Shafroth	Underwood
France	Moses	Sheppard	Vardaman
Gay	Myers	Sherman	Walsh
Hale	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	Warren
Hardwick	Nugent	Smoot	Wolcott
Jones, Wash.	Overman	Spencer	
Kendrick	Page	Sterling	
Kenyon	Pittman	Sutherland	

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff], is absent owing to illness.

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce the absence of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRONNA, and Mr. KING answered to their names when called.

Mr. LODGE, Mr. REED, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. HARDING, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. NEW, Mr.